

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTIETH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 8, 1973

9:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A Roll Call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

Representative Ben C. Blades - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative Harold D. Stedelin - illness.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in order. The invocation this morning will be by Doctor Johnson."

Doctor Johnson: "Eternal God and Father, you have spoken the internal word by which we are lead into truth. Teach us to listen for truth in all that is said; to search out truth and all that has been written; to recognize truth when we come face to face with it in debate and discussion; and to speak the truth in our own vocation. Give us clear insight to see things as they really are, not as we sometimes like to think they are. Give us courage and wisdom to state facts honestly and cogently even though they may not reflect favorably on our own position. Help us to interpret and to understand the confusing events which pepper us with such repidity and regularity. Safeguard us against all sinicism and freshen us in our work with the constant renewal of your presence in our midst. We pray in the name of him, who is the life, the way and the truth. Amen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the Records show that Representatives Granata and Blades are absent because of illness?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. Messages from the Senate."

F. B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed the Bill with the



following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 317, 319, 333, 338, 341, 357, 359, 360, 365, 366, 367, 368, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 380, 1139, 1140, passed the Senate May 7, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Committee Reports."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture, to which House Bill 699 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture, to which House Bills 702, and 703 were referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bills do not pass. Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture, to which House Bill 763 was referred, reported sending back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the bill as amended do pass. Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture, to which House Bill 1084 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass, be re-referred to appropriations. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Bills 482, 701, 854, 907, 1036 were referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bills 598 and 985 and 986 were referred, reported sending back with a recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bills 671, 738 and 1050 were referred, reported sending back with a amendments thereto, with a recommendation the amend-



ments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Bill 861 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bills do pass, be re-referred to appropriations. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Resolution 151 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Resolution 186 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Resolution 193 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mrs. Dyer from Higher Education, to which House Bill 787, 806, 1013, were referred, reported sending back with a recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which Senate Bill 88 was referred, reported sending back pursuant to Rule 23d, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Harpstrite from Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 494 was referred, reported sending back pursuant to Rule 23d, the Bill was ordered Tabled. Mr. Epton from Insurance, to which House Bill 688 was referred, reported sending back pursuant to Rule 23d, the Bill was ordered Tabled."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Introductions."

F. B. Selcke: "House 1927. Porter. Appropriates \$210,000 to Department of Transportation. First Reading of the



Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 288. Maragos et al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, just one Agreed Resolution today, and it ah.... offers our sincerest congratulation to Mr. Dominic J. Lupporell, an outstanding American, outstanding Illinoisian, and an outstanding Chicagoian, for the very deserving recognition he will receive on May 9, when he is named Man of the Year by the Men of Talent team, and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, any discussion on the Agreed Resolution? All those in favor of the adoption, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolution is adopted. Second Readings. We're going to take the Bills on Second Reading that have to be advanced to Third, so that they won't run out of time, tomorrow or the next day. There's about three in that category. 368. Wait a minute, is Mrs. Catania here? Take it out of the Record for right now. Mr. Gibbs. Mr. Madigan. Is Mike here? Oh. Well, we'll come back to Second. Oh, there he comes now."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 706. Madigan. Bill for an Act to regulate real estate appraising and to require examination of licensing of real estate appraisers. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend



House Bill 706 on Page 1, Line 23, by inserting after the period the following: the term real estate appraisers do not include township and county assessors or their deputy assessors; by inserting between Line 33 on page 1 and Line 1 on Page....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number 1 was offered in Committee and it provides several things. Number 1, it exempts the township and county assessors from the effect of the Bill. This was offered at the request of the township assessors association. Number 2, it provides for an appraiser, who is doing a substantial amount of business within the State of Illinois, but who's offices are located outside the State. Number 3, it changes the size of the examining committee from 9 Members to 7, and Number 4, it changes some of the requirements on the Grandfather Clause. I would move for adoption of the Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mike, could you tell me why the township assessors didn't want to be in this? Don't they think they have to be qualified?"

Madigan: "I really don't, no, Cal, why they made that request of me, but their representative approached me the morning of the Committee hearing and requested that they be exempted out, and Mr. Pappas, Representative Pappas,



who is a Member of the Committee, agreed with their feeling on that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would move for adoption of this Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right ah...., all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 2. Madigan. Amend House Bill 706 on Page 1, Line 22 by deleting 'this' and inserting in lieu thereof 'their'. Page 1, Line 29, by inserting immediately after the period, the following and so forth."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment Number 2 makes several changes which are technical in nature. Number 1, it changes this to their in one Section of the Bill. Number 2, it sets out more specifically the responsibility of the appraiser for the real estate appraiser trainee. Number 3, it sets out the ability of a junior college or other private educational insitutions to act as a testing center for the examinations and Number 4, it makes another grammatical change. I would move for adoption of the Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor, say



'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. Let's go back to 631."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 631. A Bill for an Act to provide treatment for alcoholics in Department of Mental Health, to establish, rehabilitation program. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah.... one Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 631, Page 1, by deleting lines 13 through 17 and inserting thereof the following and so forth."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, how many Amendments do you have there, just one?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How many amendments, Mr. Clerk, are there?"

F. B. Selcke: "One Committee Amendment."

Gibbs: "Amendment Number 1 is.... what.... excuse me.

Mr. Speaker, can I have a minute here? I just want to check to see....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, let's ah.... is Mrs. Catania here now? All right, there she is. Let's take that out of the Record for just a moment, there, for Mr. Gibbs and we'll go to Mrs. Catania's 368."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 368. Bill for an Act to amend Section 215 of the Employment Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a Second time, and ah.... George, call up and see what's happened to 368, if we adopted any other amendments. Mrs. Catania,



did we adopt Amendments 1 and 2, or were they Tabled?"

Catania: "I believe they were adopted. I would like to take it out of the Record. I'm still waiting for a fiscal note, which I hope to get later today."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You want it out of the Record? All right. Mr. Gibbs is ready." All right, 361 has been read a Second time and Amendment Number 1 has been read and the gentleman is going to address himself to that Amendment. Committee Amendment Number 1."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe there's Amendment 2, which has also been filed, which they found there, and I would like to move at this time, to Table Amendment Number 1. I believe there were two Amendments and the Second Amendment was found there, and I want to move at this time to Table Amendment Number 1."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... the gentleman has offered to move the adoption, to move to Table Committee Amendment Number 1. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to Table, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment Number 1 is Tabled. And now the gentleman, read Amendment Number 2."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 2. Gibbs. Amend House Bill 631, Page 1, by deleting lines 13 through 17 and so forth."

Gibbs: "Amendment Number 2, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is an Amendment to the Division of Alcoholism Bill which



is created under the Department of Mental Health, and what the Amendment does is, we met with the Department and there were certain duplications in the original Bill, concerning the keeping of Records, visitation and other problems, and we wanted to make them uniform. Therefore, we deleted them from the original Bill, and inserted them in the Amendment, and I move for the adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion on the Gentleman's amendment. Question's on its adoption. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments. Third Reading. All right, House Bills, Third Reading. Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. To introduce to you, Mrs. Joseph Ebbesen, from DeKalb, and with her, Mrs. Arlene Osenburg and her husband, Warren, right up here in the front gallery, fine outstanding supporters of the State of Illinois and the General Assembly."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we're going to start off with ah.... with the Bills on the 8th. And that's 468."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 468. Washington. An Act creating the Right of Privacy Commission, defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."



Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to thank the Body for sending this Bill over for me yesterday. I couldn't be here. But House Bill 468 is a simple Right of Privacy Commission. Two places in our Constitution sets out quite clearly that the citizens of this State shall have a right of privacy and that the guarantee to.... support of that right shall be supported by the Courts. However, nowhere that I know of in this State or any other State has the right of privacy been clearly delineated by any Legislative Body. It's a quadmire. It's a confused area. It needs particular and precise delineation, in the areas of computers and in the areas of credits, information just to name two. Mr. Speaker, may I have some order, please? There is a companion bill, which is in the Appropriations Committee, asking for \$10,000. This package passed the General Assembly last session by a tremendous vote. It was reluctantly vetoed by the Governor. We strongly think that this is an area which should be clearly investigated and the rights of privacy delineated for the People of the State and I ask your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Washington, this area is already being covered by the Data Information Systems Commission, and has been doing so for some time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."



Washington: "If that's a question, then I simply can respond by saying that the Data Information Study Commission is only dealing with a narrow aspect of an entire problem. The whole area of privacy goes much beyond data processing. It deals with the question of what does one do with credit information? It deals with the whole question of the area of wire tapping. It deals with all of the ah.... varied ways by which people introlobe and try to interfere with privacy in terms of home, office or business. Or employment rights. The Committee that you mention, has not even began to deal with the entire problem."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... I think this Bill has some dangerous potential. Ah.... if this Commission would have subpoena powers, as I'm sure it will, I can envision ah... certainly not the distinguished chief sponsor, but some other person subpoenaing in ah.... law enforcement authorities and asking them questions about their procedures, about investigations and their method of investigation, and ah.... this could be a very sensitive area. Ah.... I'm not saying that the information ought not to be available, but I am very concerned about public hearings and a commission with wide-ranging subpoena powers, subpoenaing in law enforcement, and I rather suspect that this ah... lurks somewhere between the lines, if not on the line. Now the Illinois



Legislative Investigating Commission, is set up and has been set up for a long time to accomplish just this purpose, and it has investigators who are skilled investigators. It has an Executive Director, who knows the field and knows his business, and I would submit, in a topic that could probably create lots of controversy and lots of litigation. We ought to rely on the ah.... Legislative Investigating Commission, which has consul, skilled consul. We could rely on the Legislative Council, which has research facilities and other means of acquiring the information that the gentleman seeks to I suppose draft legislation, guaranteeing a right to privacy, which the United States Supreme Court has found to exist somewhere in the Constitution. So I think we should be very careful about this Bill and ah.... I oppose it. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... Any further discussion? All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think I've truly grasped the opposition to this Bill. If the previous speaker is saying that the citizens of the State of Illinois can rest easily because we have a Legislative Investigating Commission, then I tremble in my boots. I didn't know that we had charged that Commission with the responsibility of delineating the rights of privacy for the people of the State of Illinois, and if we did, I think rather than peruse in this particular Bill, maybe we better



go back and look at the charge that we gave to Illinois Information Investigating Commission. From my indication of that Commission, all they do is take particular cases and dramatize them with very fine and expensive brochures and many cases, are castigating these people without evidence, without a right to a hearing, passing out pamphlets dealing with specific individuals throughout the State, and in many cases, I think, defaming, defaming do you here, the rights of citizens of the People of the State of Illinois. The Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission is the best argument for the passage of this Bill. Now what is wrong, what is wrong with this Legislative Body, or the General Assembly, calling to account those people who are responsible for all the printed information that flows through this State. What is wrong with the General Assembly investigative body determining what is done with all that data processing material. What is wrong with this General Assembly looking into the whole area of wire tapping. What is wrong with that? Isn't that our fundamental and basic responsibility to protect the rights of the People of the State of Illinois, particularly when the con-con, which we just voted in, makes it very clear in Article I, Section 12 and 16, that the People of the State of Illinois shall have the right of privacy. I defy anyone in this General Assembly, including the lawyers, to stand up here and define privacy. We haven't



done it in the State of Illinois. We haven't done it in any State of Union. It is about time we did so. Need I mention to you, need I mention to you that the biggest problem in this Country today, the biggest problem in this Country today, is the invasion of the right of privacy. I think this is a good Bill. I think it should be voted up. This is not a star chambered procedure. What I'm asking for is a group of men selected by the Leadership of both Houses, with a very small budget, to simply study the whole area of the right of privacy. I think that we would be remiss in our responsibilities if we did not do that, and I close by saying, as I said before, that the best argument for this is the patterns and the practice of the Illinois Legislative Investigation Commission. I ask your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 468 pass. All those in favor, will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "I rise to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. Ah.... there's been some conversation on this Bill with regard to a prior commission. The Sponsor of this Bill said that this Commission didn't confront the kinds of problems that he wishes discussed in this Commission Study, and I believe the gentleman is entirely correct. And the detractor to this Bill, who spoke earlier, about certain apprehensions, I think, relate cogent reason why we should have this



Study Commission. We're in the age of sibernation, Mr. Speaker, we're in the age of the influence of our lives. And right of privacy has to emerge as one of the few vested of liberties left. And I suggest that this is the kind of study, openly studied regarding all facits of privacy and that this is a good Bill and should be passed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, Mr.... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also would like to extend my explanation of vote at this point. It seems to me the matter is not one that is of recent history, but one that has come into the fore as a consequence of the development of the computer and other devices. If I could just take a few moments to indicate to you what some of the problems have been in the past and probably what they are today, with the arrival of technology. Let me point out to you that ah.... Doctor ah..... Supreme Court Justice Brandike, long ago, in 1898 pointed out that the principal which protects personal writing and all other productions not against theft, but against publication in any form, is in reality not the principle of private property, but that of invalid personality. The same protection is afforded to emotions and sensations and thoughts, whether expressed in writings or in conduct and conversation, in attitude or facial expression. I think we can.... I think that's enough, Mr. Speaker."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in order to explain my vote, what you are doing here is duplicating in money for the same investigating things that we are already doing in Data Information Systems. When you're talking about the computerization and so forth, that is exactly what we have concerned ourself with for several years, and are continuing. What you are also doing is opening up Pandora's Box, and Pandora's Box, in this particular case, is the fact that you must have software systems, which we in the Information Systems have provided safeguards for the People of the State of Illinois, for our judicial and our Legislative and policing agencies and again, if you're going to have one commission on top of the other, these People are going to get worn out appearing before us and this is a waste of money."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, further discussion. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 89 'ayes', 34 'nays', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the vote, by which House Bill 448, was passed, lie on the Table.... Be reconsidered, I'm sorry."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."



Washington: "I move that that Motion lie on the table, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentleman's Motion, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the gentleman's motion prevails. 555."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 555. An Act to implement and regulate a Lottery within the State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to consider also 554, with 555. It has the enabling money."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... that takes an affirmative vote of 107, so gentleman now has moved ah.... to hear 554 at the same time with 555, but it's not.... it doesn't run out of time until May 25, so that will take 107 affirmative votes. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion, vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the ah.... appropriation for the Lottery Bill. I think we're letting it slip by us a little quickly here. We're kind of changing our principals very drastically and with this and with the next Bill, the State is getting into the gambling business. And I think it's deserving, perhaps of a little more discussion and a



little more consideration than just to fly through as it did. As I saw the board there, where there were just two of us that felt the State ought to stay out of gambling and I think if we reflect a little bit, I think that there are more than that who will feel that State government ought to finance itself in some way other than gambling."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, just so there's no misunderstanding about what that vote was. We had called House Bill 555, which expires today. Ah.... and the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, when he was recognized, asked leave to have House Bill 554 heard today with 555, because it's the appropriation. I suggested that that would take 107 affirmative votes before that bill could be considered today with 555. So this is not the passage vote on 554. All right, on this question, there are 119 'ayes' and 2 'nays' and the gentleman's motion having received the required number of votes is ah.... prevails. Now, the gentleman, ah.... you better read 554."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 554. An Act making a permanent and continuing appropriation to State Lottery Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman ah.... from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." Are you going to ask for leave to have these bills discussed together."

Giorgi: "Yes, I thought that's what I just did."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, you didn't... you got, you got it put up to the point where...."



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respectfully request that both Bills be heard together, cause neither one is good without the other."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... separate vote on each one. All right, the gentleman's asked for leave to have both of these Bills heard for discussion purposes. Is there any objection to that? All right, hearing no objection then, both of these Bills having been read, the gentleman may proceed to discuss them."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, ah.... there are many in varied approaches to ah.... urge in the enactment of a Lottery Bill, and I think the Majority Leader sort of zeroed in on what really we're going to be talking about. I didn't want to get into that. I wanted to get into pleasantries of the Lottery. I wanted to get into the wonderful surveys that were conducted all over the country, of people wanting lotteries. I wanted to get into the fact that ah.... when you're talking about gambling, biblical quotations, it's only mentioned once. I wanted to say that this Lottery Bill, the net prizes to the State and the net prizes to the People ah.... is going into the common school fund, but I wanted to say that if I were the Governor, I would veto the Lottery Bill and earmark all the funds for prizes, rather than some of the funds for of governmental operation. But that isn't my point today. My point is to urge the passage of a lottery bill and I



want to talk about what the Majority Leader mentioned, gambling. This is the third time in our Illinois history, as we've gone down the road to greatness that the word 'gambling' has emerged out of the General Assembly. The first time was when we legalized paramutual betting and since the war, since the war, the State of Illinois and the dignified gentleman sitting here in the General Assembly skinned six hundred million dollars off of the two dollar bettor, to support some types of State government. Then we went on a little further and our constitutional delegate, who should be commended, for removing the prohibition against lotteries in the Constitution when they presented it to the People, saw the enactment of Bingo. And then the profits of doom are saying that we're opening the doors to syndicated crime, organized hoodlums and the takeover of Bingo by the crime syndicate. Well, I think those who were prophesized in... are probably sitting around reading their clippings by themselves. Now, last year, we took from the race track, gambling in Illinois fifty million dollars. And that fifty million dollars found itself in the mainstream in Illinois. In fact, about 15 million dollars was used to help rebuild McCormick Place

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, rise?"

Caldwell: "I can't hear the gentleman. There's too much noise."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Georgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I want to read to three or four of the opponents of the Bill that in McCormick Place next week, with ah... monies used from race track skinning, the Moody Bible Institute is going to have a concert there. The week after that, we're going to have a Jesus rally with Pat Boone. Now, I would like to have the opponents of the Bill talk about how we're stunting the growth of our ah... Illinoisians with this. Now, they'll talk about crime, but I have the FBI Crime Report in my hand and it indicates our crime rate is already greater than New York, New Jersey or Pennsylvania, so that the Lottery isn't going to create anymore criminals in Illinois. They talk about church. Our church attendance indicates that we're only average, so we're not a more christian state than any other state. In fact, the makeup of our State is very much similar to the makeup of the states that have a Lottery. There are a lot of ah... good ramifications, there's been surveys made all over the State. Jack Mably of Chicago took a survey a couple of years ago, and the survey indicated that the People of Illinois were for a lottery by ah... number of 40 to 1. The opponents will claim that the poor people buy tickets. I have studies here that indicate that the poor people do not buy ticks, because if that were the case, the law of average would indicate that the poor people were the



majority of winners, when in reality they are not. In our Bill that controls our county fairs, the law demands, the law that controls our county fairs demands that monies from the race track gambling go into their coffers to support the maintenance and rehabilitation of county fairs. We use our gambling money to pay for the future farmers of America's expenses and the 4-H expenses and for many other and varied reasons. Now, Illinois, with its natural economic base, with its healthy attitude, and with the border built up entirely around it, would conceivably outstrip any other State in proceeds from the Lottery. We sincerely estimate that we'll net to the State as well to the common school fund over a million dollars a week, when we finally get into the Lottery operation. I say that this isn't a moral issue. I say we faced that moral issue and decided a long time ago, that we're going to use these type funds for the betterment of the citizens of Illinois, and I'd like to have one of the opponents point to me where this hasn't shown to be the case. And I'd appreciate some support on the Lottery Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I rise in opposition to this Bill, as I did to the same proposal last year. But in doing so, I would like to acknowledge the sincerity of Representative Giorgi for whom I have every respect as a friend and colleague. But



this respect does not erase my responsibility to speak against what I consider to be a questionable Bill. No matter how we earmark the proceeds and no matter how we try to sweep in the lottery pot, it still doesn't come out smelling like a evening in Paris or Channel No. 5. Yes, the promoters want it. And yes, it will raise money. It will raise millions and yes, it will raise hopes, but I say it will raise false hopes. We owe our people in Illinois more than this. We owe them the truth in my opinion, and we owe them the admission that for every millionaire created, under this proposal, there will be millions of losers. Millions of people plut to their savings and left with nothing but ticket stubs as a consolation prize. It is a slick way of raising revenues. It's a painless way, but I believe it's a paracitic way. Making it easy for the legislature, legislator to abandon his responsibility, to raise revenue through other means. It's a regressive form of taxation. A cop-out, whereby we can stand aside, and say well, we're not forcing anyone to buy tickets and this is true enough. We simply make it possible for our people to buy the tickets and then let the very human desire to take a chance take over. My colleagues, this Lottery or any other has to be rigged against the bettor. Less than half of the proceeds can go for prizes. It's bad business. It's bad business economically. It taps money from those least able



to afford it. How long will it be, I ask you, before we raise welfare payments to meet the cost of those spending their money that shouldn't be spending their money on Lottery tickets. Much is said about New Jersey and this experiment elsewhere, but let me tell you, Ralph Batch, the New Jersey State Lottery Commissioner said this about the Lottery in New Jersey. He said 'I don't think lotteries will solve the financial woes of the State, nor are they the salvation of the taxpayers.' Governor Ogilvie last year described the lottery as a corrupting influence and I think it is. It does encourage our people to waste their money. It does encourage bad habits to finance good causes, whether it's schools or whatever else it may be. It simply is not the way. Let's not buy the false argument that more gambling, backed by the State, will help educate our kids or provide other social benefits, or that these services will go by the boards if we don't promote the Lottery. Or the idea that people gamble anyway, so let's get a piece of the action. Let's not create a legion of silent losers, encouraged to fritter away their savings in search of pie in the sky. Let's not legislate into fact the something for nothing philosophy. Let's not draft delusion and I think this is delusion, into law. Let's not help the poor become poorer by exploiting human weakness. Now my colleagues, I am well aware that what I say here today may be of little effect on the final



resort. But I urge you, in closing, I urge you, let's draw the line on State sponsored gambling and draw that line here today with the defeat of this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from ah.... I've got to go over here for one first, o'okay? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos. Then I'll come back to you."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... I would like to speak on the the measure, but in the meantime, I'd like to take a point of personal privilege, and introduce in the Speaker's balcony some outstanding labor leaders from the southside area of Chicago, Mr. Frank Guzo, who is the President of Local 1033 of the Steel Workers. Will you please stand. Anthony Frazier, Robert Davis, Lawrence Stringfellows, Steven Noholloc and Joseph Calona, all from the District 31 of District Steelworkers. Glad to have you with us. Now, while I'm on the Floor, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the sponsor a question of the Bill, if I may."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... Representative Giorgi, what percentage of the Lottery receipts will the State receive in form of Revenue, if you could tell us at this time?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Maragos, our Lottery Bill is patterned after the six lotteries in existence, and this decision is made by the five commissioners that run the lottery and the superintendent, but from all ah.... experience and all indication, forty-five percent will accrue to the common



school fund, forty-five percent for prizes and ten percent for expenses. Now, then, if there's a little bit of deviation from that, it allows the commissioners to make up the change, but we expect to realize to the State and to the common school fund almost 100 million dollars a year for a gift from the people."

Maragos: "Do you have any figures in comparing what the receipts are from the mutual race tracks?"

Giorgi: "Well, all I can tell you that in Illinois, since the war, I'm going to give you that because it's staggering, two billion dollars was wagered at Illinois tracks since 1946. Last year, six hundred million dollars was wagered at Illinois tracks, and when the people came to the betting window, we told them, we'll take the first fifteen cents of every two dollar bet and we'll let you split the \$1.85 but it hasn't diminished it, the running to the windows."

Maragos: "So in other words, this form of ah... receipts from gambling will be greater than receipts from gambling that we've been having for many years since World War II is that correct?"

Giorgi: "That's correct. In one year, we'll do what they do two years at the track because the track people make all the money, I guess."

Maragos: "A few years ago, we also passed a Bingo Bill. Are the receipts going to be proportionately higher by this form than they were from the Bingo Bill?"



Giorgi: "The receipts from Bingo in the last year approximated two million dollars and one million goes into the Mental Health Fund and one million dollars goes into the common school fund, but again, Bingo is a participatory game, where the not for profit organizations are trying to make the most. We're just getting a percent of their... for licensing."

Maragos: "Yeow. One more question, Representative Giorgi. The administration of this Lottery, where's it going to be sold? Where are the tickets going to be sold? Is that going to be up to the Departments to govern it, or is it the Department of Revenue, or is it a special section to administer the selling of these lottery tickets?"

Giorgi: "We create a commission made up of five members and a superintendent. They choose their chairman, but they are all confirmed by the Senate. It is the.... the Commission has all the powers that it needs to put a lottery into effect. They have the power to license sellers, to get a police check, to get a creditability check, but the Governor has veto power over their minutes or over any action that he feels is not good for the State of Illinois and it's got fool proof guarantees in it. There will be no hoodlum infiltration. There will be no syndicate infiltration. It's going to be a clean lottery, run by the State of Illinois for the People of Illinois that are demanding a Lottery."

Maragos: "Thank you."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham.

Now let me say so we know where we are here. On this side, I have Cunningham, Deuster, Kriegsman, Cox. And over on this side I had Maragos. Then I have Mr. Caldwell next and Rayson. Are there any others just so you all know when you'll be called. Over on our side are there any Mr. Hunsicker. Any more? Mr. Totten, do you want to be heard? O'kay. All right, Mr. Cunningham, you want to proceed?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I once knew a man that had four crafty sons and these sons liked to trade with each other. And they became very skilled at the gentle art of gypping each other in trades, and as a result of those trades, they were able to amass great paper fortunes, so they resolved each with the other that none of them would ever need to work again, because they would earn their livelihood just trading with each other. Well, obviously, that system of earning a livelihood couldn't long endure and neither can a government long endure that seeks to finance itself merely by gypping its members. I say to you that the first casualty of state-wide lottery in Illinois will be the work ethic upon the... which the well being yea the very existence of this State depends. I would ask the Sponsor, how do you ever propose to teach anyone, young or old, rich or poor, that the true cost of anything is the amount of life that must be exchanged for it if every drug store, every supermarket and



every filling station has the neon sign that says invest a dollar a week and win a million. The University of Illinois has the proud motto 'Labor and Learn'. The unspoken premise is that the student is qualified to make some worthwhile contribution to society for which society will reimburse him. The concept of gambling is just the opposite. There never was a gambler on the face of the earth who didn't want something for nothing. This House should think more than twice before it puts the legality upon the pernicious practice of pandering to human weakness. Now a couple of years ago, thank you, Dan, a couple of years ago, the people for Bingo said, vote for Bingo, we'll raise money faster than you can count it. The problem of raising money will be solved in Illinois forever. Well, the results are in now and it's a fund raiser. It has been a dismal flop. If administrative costs were taken into account in computing the gain from Bingo, this State would be lucky to break even. Don't sell your constituents short. Don't think for a moment that they're a bunch of freeloaders. Recognize that they project the untold riches of... that come from Lottery, that those figures, too, must be scaled down to reality. I say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that a House that is shrewed enough to observe the menace to the Republic, which would result, we're putting 15 year olds on library boards, is smart enough to know, that Lottery isn't the way to go. I ask you to vote your consciences. I ask you to vote 'no'."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Caldwell. Now Mr. Fary's up."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this very timely measure. The People of Illinois are no different than the People in other parts of the country. Representative Giorgi has distributed a fact sheet giving you the net profits for Lotteries, State Lotteries in some six states. These are facts, Ladies and Gentlemen. I can appreciate the fact that many of us, shedding crocodile tears here, because we do not want to face the truth. As long as human beings have been in existence, there has been the tendency to take a chance. It's mentioned in the Bible. Look if you want to. Verify it. It speaks of it in the Bible. And I'm saying to you that as long as we have human beings, we're going to have this controversy. I'm simply saying that we ought to face facts. Here in America, Lottery or whatever games of chance you want to call it, many of our most famous educational institutions came into existence and have been permitted to thrive because the People were allowed to gamble if you please. Lottery is a fact of life, and those of us who fail to recognize it are only kidding ourselves. I recall several years ago, when we instituted a sales tax. It was an emergency measure. We're still saddled with it, and it has gone up, I think, with one percent to five percent, and the only reason we haven't increased it, we dare not, because none of us would get re-elected. We



have tried all sorts of measures, and we're still looking for money to run the State and provide the various services that are needed. And when I say to you that all we have to do is to determine how much money is taken from paramutual bets throughout the State. Every State fair, every State fair in this State is supported from paramutual betting, and I guarantee you, you couldn't get a vote on this Floor to do away with paramutual betting. Now, my contention is that whether or not you pass this law, whether or not you would ah.... ah.... repeal paramutual betting, the people are going to continue to gamble, and what we are dealing here with are facts of life. I would suggest to you that those of us who for moral reasons ah... think that this is bad legislation, you have to deal with the facts and look at what has happened in other States. Now, Illinois usually takes the lead. I can understand. If we perhaps will pass this law and enact, we will become the seventh or the eighth or the ninth state and you can bet your bottom dollar within a few years, all of the states are going to be using this or similar methods to raise money, and it's money that would be spent anyway and would curtail the illegal activity in this field that is rampant throughout this Nation. I think if we would face facts quit kidding ourselves, be honest and do what we did with the Bingo Bill, I think that we would get on and get the thanks of the public. I'm certainly hoping that all of



us would be honest with ourselves. Display integrity and vote this Bill out."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... the.... Mr. Murphy will be the temporary speaker now."

Murphy: "The only ones who can speak to this Bill are the ones who are for it. Ah.... the gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with all due difference, I thought I heard another Member make a point of order, and I didn't want to be discourteous and have the Chair overlook that, if that....."

Murphy: "Proceed."

Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker suggested that we've got to face up...."

Murphy: "One minute."

Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Murphy: "Yes, Representative Friedland, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Murphy: "State your point."

Friedland: "I would like to at this time to introduce in the gallery to my right, the Central Lewistown Junior High School with their teacher, Mr. John Crew, an old college buddy of mine, on the right."

Mr. Murphy: "The gentleman from Lake may now proceed."



Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a previous speaker suggested we've got to face up to the facts of life, and we've got to legalize what people may be doing. Now up in Lake County, we've got a rage of topless dancing going. I suppose that someone might suggest that we ought to license and regulate topless dancing to bring in a little money for mass transit. I believe we have some prostitution taking place. I suppose someone will suggest we ought to license and tax prostitution. Now I think every member ought to take a look at this Bill and look at what it really is. Part of the Bill is ah... the last three pages, deal with the criminal code. Everybody ought to know that right now, a Lottery is a crime, so this Bill proposes that we not only change it from a crime to an innocent activity, but we put the State of Illinois in the business. Now what this really is is that this is a poor tax that takes advantage of the sucker. You ought to consider that the odds in New York are 26 to 1 and yet we want to have 7,000, 10,000 state of Illinois agents out at every supermarket, where the women are complaining about the high prices of hamburger. And we'll have a State agent saying, don't buy your hamburger, put a buck on the Lottery ticket, and they're not going to tell them what the odds are. 26 to 1, against winning, and in New York for the high prize, the odds are 100,000 dollars 100,000 against 1. Do we want to fleece the sucker.



Is that what we want the State of Illinois to do. There are a lot of facts of life and we should not be spawning the bureacracy, moving the Illinois State government into the numbers racket, and I think this is morally indefensible and you've got to draw a line somewhere. We put Bingo into law so we could take grandmothers off the streets. That's all right, but we don't have to put the State of Illinois agents, moving out in every part of this State promoting the concept that you can get something for nothing and even those who run the lotteries in other States realize that we're dealing with the promotion of greed, and I urge everyone to vote against this bad bill."

Murphy: "Now, let's have some silence in this House so we can proceed and move on with this calendar and get this fine bill passed. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Ah... ah... you hit it on the nail, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a good Bill. And I think the last gentleman who spoke kind of crystalizes the issue, where we're at and what we're trying to do. He mentioned, should we legalize prostitution and so on, I'd say 'yes'. And I say 'yes', because this is not the kind of sanction under the criminal law, but instead we should try to control the sickness in society through other means. I'm trying to suggest this is where we should be as lawmakers. We should review all the laws on our criminal statutes to determine



those which should be kept and should be enforced and those which either affect a victimless crime or affect a cancer in society, which can be better controlled through other means. So when we talk about legalization of anything such as gambling in this particular instance, when are we going to learn that this is kind of a semantical hangup when we're trying to impose our morality on a situation in our society. We're not saying we want to legalize gambling by this Lottery Bill, we're saying that Lottery itself is not the kind of activity that should be covered by the criminal law. Instead, it should be controlled through other methods, and it is being controlled through other methods. They have a commission here. They're going to perpetually study these problems. It's a minor situation insofar as it might want to do. It may have a little plum in giving the State some revenue, but whether it does or not, I still say it's not a proper subject to be covered by the criminal law, and it's a good Bill, Mr. Speaker. It should be supported and we should review the criminal law and all other activities of gambling. The Knapp Commission, specially said we should legalize gambling in America. That doesn't mean that we approve of it. If we can get over the hangup that legalization means we proved or even condoned, then, you know, we're not doing our job. So I say let's support this Bill."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Kriegsman. For what reason.... Oh, I see. Proceed, John."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Kriegsman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. In the essence of saving time, I would just like to say that I support all those speakers who have spoke before me, in opposition of this Bill. This is your chance to protect those people who are considered the have nots of our State of Illinois. This is your chance to keep from building up the rolls of the welfare department, because, just because a person is on welfare will not stop them from going to the lottery and buying tickets, and as a result of that, the state is supporting the lottery with its welfare rolls. Let's stop this cancerous practice that can happen by the passage of this Lottery Bill. I firmly am opposed to the Lottery Bill."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fary."

Fary: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. The first Lottery Bill ever introduced in this House was introduced by myself, Representative Bill Murphy, our present speaker and Uncle Louie Janczak and that was back in 1961. The first Bingo bill was presented prior to that by Fary, Murphy and Janczak. And it took us 16 years to pass the Bingo Bill and it is very successful. Now I don't know how many of you fellows heard of John Starney. I have here a book, that every man in this House would love to sit down and peruse and study, because Starney was a magician and an entertainer and he's the world's formost gamblene authority. He was hired by Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam, mind you, to go to the Army and Navy camps and perform and alett the soldiers



to the crookedness of gambling. How dice can be crooked, how cards can be crooked. How to detect them. These kids don't get much money when they're in the service and you'll never prevent gambling, you know it and I know it, so they tried their luck at something and the cards are stacked against them, and the cards are marked and the dice are loaded, so Uncle Sam, Uncle Sam, our Uncle Same hired this guy and he said you go out there and teach these kids and show them the difference between right and wrong. Now Starney was chased out of Las Vegas, Nevada, not because he was crooked, because he was too smart. He knew odds, he knew how to figure them, compute them. Here's the book that he wrote. It costs \$12.50. Any of you guys want to see it, go through it. It will explain Bingo and Bingo can be crooked. I'm afraid that one of these days, that the crooked games are going to turn up and it won't even be funny. Now my answer to that is, it's crooked, it can be shown and made crooked, so is counterfeiting of U.S. currency illegal. And yet it goes on despite the very, very heavy penalties involved. Now, John Starney had a survey made in the entire country in the places he went to. And here's what he says. 'One of the questions I asked the 61,500 men'... Mr. Speaker, will you pound that gavel. Get us a little order here. This is your Bill and my Bill."

Murphy: "O'okay, John. Let us have some order in the House, and some quiet so we can hear the discussion and proceed



and get these bills moved on the calendar. Please, let us have some quiet."

Fary: "One of the questions I asked the 61,500 men and women I polled during my gambling survey work was 'Do you favor a government sponsored lottery in the United States?' I found that 36,541 persons were in favor, 7,213 were opposed and 17,746 were undecided. This happily indicates that if the question were to appear on the ballot in the near future, the odds are that Americans would vote about 5 to 1 to legalize a National Lottery, even if all the undecided voters opposed it, the votes would still be 6 to 4 in favor of its passage. In this survey, he asked some questions. I want you to please listen. Number 1 is, do you gamble? 74% of the women said 'yes'. 67% of the men said 'yes'. In the next question was, the type or activity of gambling that you would indulge in. Number 1 was card playing. Number 2 was lotteries, raffles, numbers and Bingo. Number 3 was carnival games. Number 4 is dice games, horse racing. Number 6 is betting of sports events and elections. Number 7 was punch boards and sales cards. Number 8 was slot machines and ah.... consoles. The Third question was, why do you gamble. 70% replied, they gambled to win money. 25% gambled for pleasure, excitement and thrills. 5% gambled, and these characters who go to Bingo parlors, race tracks or casinos, to mingle with women and vice versa. If you do not gamble, why not was the next question. 50% percent said they could not afford it. 35% said they



do not believe it is possible to win in the long run. 5% said they use to gamble but had stopped because they lost more than they could afford. 5% said they know nothing about gambling. 2% stated that they believe all forms of gambling are sinful. 3% gave the assorted reasons such as my husband would break my neck or my wife would divorce me if she knew I was gambling. The next question was, are you in favor of a national lottery? 5 to 1 were for a national lottery. Now why send money to Ireland? Why send it to the old country? Why not keep it here. If people want to indulge and participate and you talk about the little guy being exploited, the little guy who can't afford it, you still have his policy, his football tickets and he's still got his 10 cents and 25 cents and 50 cents horse racing. Where lotteries are legal, regulations demand that Lottery operators be of unquestionable character and reputation before being issued a license. There are no such restrictions on the illegal operators who often set up business, with especially enough money to print their first batch of tickets. Phoney tickets are printed in basements, phoney tickets are sold, you don't stand a chance of winning, you can't win, because the tickets are printed in dirty old basements, and they're not authentic. Hundreds of lotteries sprang up overnight, operated by crooks, confidence men and chiefs who did a blooming business. That's when the policy numbers, raffles, base-



ball, football pools, treasury tickets, Irish hospital sweepstakes were created. In 1964, now get this fellows, and girls, in 1964, 81 nations had lotteries. 81 nations. At that time, these operations took in 2.2 billion dollars and netted 853 million dollars for education, hospitals, charities and social welfare grants. In Pert, Australia, now get this, you talk about your odds of not being able to win, one out of every thirteen is the winner. And I'm sure that every man in this House and every Lady will take a chance with odds like that, 13 to 1, and they talk about a million and a thousand to 1."

Murphy: "Representative Fary, will you bring your remarks to a close, please. Your time is up."

Fary: "Mr. Murphy, I'll use your time, all right?"

Murphy: "I don't have any time at the moment. I'm in a hurry."

Fary: "A lottery is not a tax. It is not a bread and butter tax. It is not a sales tax. Only those who wish to subscribe may participate and the opponents of this legislation are not forced to participate because it is not a tax. When New Hampshire instituted a Lottery in 1964, opponents raised the traditional and moral arguments and predicted that the Lottery would attract criminal elements. Seven years of experience has not born out their predictions. And a three-man sweepstakes commission employed Edward J. Powers, a former FBI agent as Executive



Director of the Lottery. And there never has been a wisp of scandal. Now, the clock and the steeple of St. Anne's Episcopal Church in Annapolis, was bought from the proceeds of a public library and...."

Murphy: "And the clock here is up, John, so bring your remarks to a close."

Fary: "I've got your time, Murph, I'm using your ten minutes."

Between 1765 and 1806, the Massachusetts Legislature authorized four lotteries to build dormitories and supply equipment for Harvard, Dartmouth, Yale, Columbia, William and Mary, Union, Brown University and profit for these. This Bill is the answer to all of the State's financial ills, Brother Bill, right. It is a voluntary extraction of monies, a painless extraction. Bill, I'll conclude now, but analyze this, perhaps this Bill would be the paving of something for the future. When Professor Lee was here, Professor Lee, he said that a Lottery can only last 40 years. Well maybe he's right. What's wrong with 40 years? Forty years when Bill Murphy and I, Senator Mohr and Louis Janczak are going to meet here in the year 2000. We're going to meet here and have a little drink. A toast to the great State of Illinois."

Murphy: "O'kay, we've had our toast now, John. Times up. Representative from Coles County, Representative Cox."

Cox: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Murphy: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. Contrary 'no'. The 'ayes' have



it. Ah.... the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, may close the debate."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate a lot of the support that I got from some of my colleagues. Of course, I don't agree with everything they were talking about earlier, suggesting, but I think we're speaking for the record here. I think we ought to say for the record, not once, not once has the proponents of the Lottery ever claimed that the lottery will ever be a major fund raiser. We know conservatively that we'll net to the State of Illinois 75 million dollars, and I think it might hit a hundred million dollars. But 100 million dollars is only 1-1/2% of our total state budget, so we admit from the beginning, we're speaking for the Record. Some people are talking about the people who are deluded, well as John Fary ably said, our Commissioners can insure that there is a winner for every 13 buyers. Now, I would like to ask the person that talk about delusion, if he talked to the hundreds and hundreds of the winners in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In New Jersey, they created 25 new millionaires, and one of the things that's bothering America today is bothering the industrial mind of America is boredom and frustration on the assembly line and what's better than to give a guy something to hope for, that lottery might strike him. And we're not talking about per capita expenditures that are going to bankrupt families. We're talking about a painless gift, something they can



enjoy. We can see the lottery being drawn at the Chicago Bear football game. We can see it being drawn at the McCormick Place, where we're not supporting some of McCormick's efforts with gambling skimming at the track. We can see it called at the State fair, where we're paying a lot of their bills with gambling dollars. We can see it called at the Cubs Park, Sox Park. There are some services that we ought to provide for the pleasure of the People of Illinois. And I said earlier, even in danger of losing my Lottery Bill, if I were the Governor of the State, I would veto this Lottery Bill to the extent that all the money would go for prizes and the only money we would keep would be for the operation of the Lottery, but ah.... wiser heads have prevailed and I've agreed that the Lottery money should go for education. This is one of the finest bills that it's been my pleasure to introduce. I was here when it wasn't fashionable to vote for the Bingo Bill, but the enthusiastic reception I've received on the street will ensure you that as long as Representative Giorgi's around he'll be co-sponsoring or sponsoring the Lottery Bill. Thank you very much."

Murphy: "The question is, shall House Bill 554 pass? All... huh? 554 and 555. Shall these Bills pass? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, to explain his vote."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I came to the House in opposition to the Lottery Bill. Since that period of time, I have had the opportunity to discuss this question with many Members of the House, many People of the community, and in fact, have sent a questionnaire to my constituents, and out of 3457 families who replied to this questionnaire, fully 69% were in favor of this Lottery. I sympathize and can understand those Members of the House who have feeling in regard to this Bill, based on moral grounds. I understand that. However, I cannot in my own mind justify a situation where we allow race tracks to operate, where we allow the biggest type of gambling in the world in regard to the stock market and the commodity market, where millions and millions of dollars are lost to all kinds of families, middle income and poor families, day in and day out. I cannot bring that argument in allowing that and having then the argument proposed against the Lottery. Therefore, because of the feeling in my district, and the cause that I think this will add nearly some 100 million dollars to an educational system, which is in greatly need of funds, I vote 'aye'."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Bill. It is none of the State's business how we spend our dollars if we want to gamble."



I repeat, it is none of the State's business. I support this Bill on the concept of law and I don't care if it raises one dollar or ten million. The law is here to protect us, each individual, from being infringed upon from being injured from others. Either to our property or to our person. It is not here to enforce so-called moral law. And I would say here, do I believe most religions do not consider gambling moral, or immoral. Most religions believe that in moderation in all things, things are good, but the point is, the law cannot and it is not the concept of law to protect people from their own vices, if you wish to consider gambling a vice. For these reasons, I believe, that we should not have gambling laws upon our statutes, because of this concept. Also, we have learned it is unenforcible and an unenforcible law is bad. We should only have gambling laws upon the statutes, to make sure that organized crime does not injure the rights and property of our citizens. Now we have heard the same old story here today, what about the poor person. The middle class and the rich legislators and other so-called reformers and do-gooders are always worried about the poor person. I haven't had any poor person tell me that they shouldn't gamble just like the rich people are doing now, like all of us are doing now. The person who goes to the store, if you'll have that example, and bet a dollar, has this one dollar of hope it might be his only chance to become rich. We



have no right to tell him that he cannot spend the dollar in this fashion, no more than we have a right to tell him that he can't have a dollar drink of whiskey. We can't tell him what he's to do with his dollar, no more than we can tell a man that he can't drive an automobile racer or jump out of a parachute. We are not here to protect individuals against themselves. We are here to promote laws...."

Murphy: "Will the gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Londrigan: "To protect society against illegal acts and others, and I suggest that we support this Bill. Thank you."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to vote 'no' on this Bill, because I think that this Bill is going to work an undue hardship on the People who can least afford to buy lottery tickets. We hear a lot about the regressive sales tax, because it works a hardship on this Class. In my opinion, the Lottery is going to be a real aggressive tax on the poor, under the guides of winning. Everyone knows that there are only a few who can win, and many, many people are going to spend their hard-earned dollars for such things and not the necessities of life. It was just recently stated by a Member on the other side that we should have the right to



spend our dollars as we see fit. This I will approve of but when a person spends his hard-earned dollar that he should spend for food for something else and then expects me to support him, I think, then I have a right to spend my dollar the way I see fit also. When we have to collect taxes by hoodwinking the public and indirectly this is what a Lottery is, a tax you can call it by any name you want. It's still the frosting and it's a tax. Then we are not only scraping the bottom of the barrel, but we've kicked the bottom of the barrel out, and I think this Bill should be defeated."

Murphy: "The Representative.... the gentleman from Union, Representative Clyde Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you had to watch the Today program today on television, you would have seen a complete and absolute and thorough discussion of Lottery and the effects it has on the states that now have it. There's one significant figure that remains in my mind. The State of Pennsylvania according to National News media this morning is realizing more than 3 million dollars a week from a legalized lottery. You talk about the numbers racket in a State, if you want to eliminate the numbers racket, get on the street with a legal 50 cent ticket and you'll eliminate, you will eliminate the numbers racket. Now, you're talking about painless sources of Revenue and bear in mind that some of the People in your District and throughout the State, when they tell



you in front of a group of people that they're opposed to the legalization of a lottery, are saying it with tongue in cheek, because they don't want to make their neighbors maybe, or somebody else close to them, to realize that they might be in favor of legalizing a lottery and secretly hoping that you will pass it. Well, I'm going to help give them that secret hope. I'm going to help bring some revenue to the State, is that more of a referendum basis than any referendum you can talk, because it says clearly if you want to buy a ticket, you can buy a ticket. If you don't want to buy a ticket, there's no one in the World going to force you to buy a ticket. It only says that this amount of Revenue whatever it may be is a revenue that is not being forced on a single solitary sole, as far as the General population of this State is concerned. I vote 'aye'."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Peoria... from Cook County, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to explain my vote. A particular situation we find ourselves in when we attempt to legalize gambling. There are only some types of gambling we find tasteful to legalize. While others, such as the numbers game, betting on athletes, we spend billions of dollars enforcing anti-gambling laws. In addition, experience in New York has shown that the Lottery had decreased attendance in Revenue at the track, something that has caused poor quality in horse racing, something



that we can ill-afford in Illinois. The total estimated Revenue from this Lottery tax will amount to some 70 million dollars. I think we are neglecting our responsibilities, when this amounts to only one and a half percent of our total state budget. We could assume our responsibility more thoughtfully by voting for an increase in the State income tax on individuals of less than one-quarter of one percent to raise the same revenue. This is an immoral and highly discriminatory tax. Gambling or lotteries do not create wealth, they only destroy it. I suggest a 'no' vote."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, is recognized to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, as you well know, when I first came here to Springfield, I was a ah.... do-gooder, that was before I met you, and I was opposed to the Bingo and Lottery."

Murphy: "That's before you were my colleague from the same district, too, wasn't it?"

Pierce: "Right. But under the tooledge of some of my seniors here in Springfield, including you, Mr. Speaker, I took a good look at some of my prejudices and I found this. I found that no one has ever been turned into a gambler by a State lottery. A State lottery doesn't provide that kind of action. A gambler is going to be very dissatisfied with a State Lottery. What a State Lottery did in Colonial times, what it does in European nations, what it can do here in Illinois, is allow the people to help



support education, teachers retirement, so whatever else you want, in a way that they enjoy on a voluntary basis. No one is forced to buy a lottery ticket. No one is required to buy a Lottery ticket. Some people have the idea that the only way to support government, is to make people suffer. There's nothing wrong with people having a little pleasure, a little excitement from a 50 cent lottery ticket, and the excitement that provides to a poor person, the chance of becoming wealthy, in order to support our schools and our teachers retirements funds. Now both candidates for Governor in the last election were opposed to any tax increase. They were opposed to a sales tax increase or an income tax increase or any new taxes. When I looked around to the problems of our schools, the problems of our mental hospitals and the drains on our general revenue, including mass transit, in the Chicago area, only one source of new revenue was available, and that was the State Lottery and that could be as much as 100 million dollars per year. And that money could be available for our schools, for our mental hospitals, for our teachers retirement funds and for local mass transit, state matching grants, if we support the State Lottery. Michigan has it. Michigan has many fundamentalist groups in the western part of the State, dutch reformed and so on. The State of Michigan has a Lottery. New York, New Hampshire, New Jersey. No scandal in any of those States. There's no



stock with lottery, like race track stock. There's no stock. It's owned by the State. It's completely managed by the State and run by the State. And I've got enough confidence in State government that we can run it properly. So, therefore, I've learned a lot in my 8 or 10 years here. One thing I learned here is that the People should be allowed to support their State government in a way that they choose. They don't want anymore real estate taxes. They don't want anymore income tax. They don't want a higher sales tax. They want a lower sales tax on food and medicine. But they're willing to accept a State Lottery. And if the People are willing to accept it and if they only buy their tickets on a voluntary basis, let the People have a lottery. We let them have Bingo. They've enjoyed. There's been no abuse. And I intend to vote for the Lottery Bill today and I can go back and explain it to my constituents of every possible religious belief. I vote 'aye'."

Murphy: "The Representative from Peoria, Representative Day."

Day: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, about 100 years ago, Lord Chesterfield said 'a Lottery is a tax on every fool in existence'. And this Bill, the odds aren't nearly as good as they are in a Las Vegas crap game. The big cut is for the House, because the stakes are small. Of course, State lotteries haven't stopped the numbers games in New York and in New Jersey. The reason for that is because the People who play the numbers game know that the State Lottery is a very poor gamble for them. From



the standpoint of State government, from the standpoint of State Finance, this is a gimmick. It's the old shell game. It thrives on suckers and it thrives on those who do not know that odds, high odds do not make a good bet, and what we're doing here today is to bet. We're betting that there's enough suckers in this State who will believe that this is good government and that this is the type of leadership that they expect from those who elect to high office. Look at the governmental officials. Look at those who have been criticized. Look at those who have been indicted, in the last few years. And look at the reasons for their indictments. Legalized gambling, horse racing, this is what has gotten governmental officials into difficulty into this State and other states. Look at those who control the City of Las Vegas...."

Murphy: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Day: "where they have legalized gambling, and look at those who at eleven and twelve o'clock at night are standing in their overalls, still playing slot machines after they have lost the big bundle in the crap game. This is not good government. And I urge you to vote 'no'."

Murphy: "Representative from Cook, Representative Fary, to explain his vote."

Fary: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the nasty man across the aisle said something about legalizing prostitution. I want to address a point of inquiry to you, Mr.



Speaker, are you listening? It is now the time for a feasibility study for a peter meter for tax purposes?"

Murphy: "You're wasting your time on your explanation of your vote, Representative Fary."

Fary: "Wait a minute now, passage of this Bill will be a victory for the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker. This is a substitute for taxes. Income therefrom will delay any thought of increasing taxes or creating additional taxes. This is an excellent source of revenue and will ease the tax burden, and I thank you for your green vote, Mr. Speaker and I also want to announce that May is National Tavern Month, and in the back room in the Democratic side, in the men's locker, cheese and crackers now being served, after you vote green. Thank you very much."

Murphy: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Had I been in the Legislature when the Bill was passed allowing the race tracks of Illinois, I would have voted vehemently against it. However, I'm in the Legislature today. We called the race track immoral, because it's legal under the statutes of Illinois. My clientele, in my experience as a lawyer, the ones who lost their houses and lost their families, because of gambling, lost them on the track, not by buying sweepstake tickets. I certainly think that this is a good Bill. I don't consider it immoral or ammorol. I consider it something that has to come. Let us not fool ourselves, the football pools continue,



the numbers rackets continue and I think that this Bill will cut down the crime syndicate's take. Therefore, I vote for the Bill."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I want to remind this Body that about four years ago, one of the best Governors in the history of the State of Illinois took a chance and got an income tax on the books. And that income tax which we needed and which would have thrown this State in the same chaotic situation that the State of Michigan and others found themselves, if it hadn't gone through, he would still be Governor. Now, I want you to face facts, as I've said, originally. I think that those of us who are voting against this Bill, are hypocrites and I say that because all of us know that if this Bill becomes law, the money that will accrue from it to the State of Illinois will stop us from imposing other taxes on the citizens. I think this is a good bill. I think we ought to quit kidding ourselves and vote it out."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, is recognized."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my no vote. There's been a lot of agonizing on the floor and off the floor today about how to vote on this Bill, and I must admit that I was one of them. I do not have, as many people have voiced, the moral objection against raising



funds to support schools through a lottery, but I am concerned about the Bill in front of us, and I did have an opportunity to talk to one of the Republican staff men, who had an opportunity to implement the New York law, and he brought to my attention some matters that haven't been too thoroughly discussed on the floor of this Chamber today among them, how are we going to market this particular lottery. We're going to have to set up a huge bureaucracy to sell, to deliver. We're going to have a cross problem. There are Federal laws which prohibit mailing prizes or delivering prizes and other problems which we are going to have to face. There's a lack, as far as I'm concerned, of a reliable estimate of how much income we are going to derive from this type of a lottery. Now I am not voting against this, as many people have expressed on the floor today that they have a moral objection, because right now I do not have a moral objection, but I think if we go ahead and pass this Bill, and the Senate passes this Bill, we as the Legislature are forfeiting some of the powers which are delegated to us. I think that we ought to know more about the administration of this type of a program, before we go ahead and give this authority to a Commission, and I urge your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, is recognized. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, is recognized."



Barnes: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in listening to many of the past speakers talking about the morality of this particular measure, I stopped and reflected on what took place in my district this past weekend. This past weekend, we received our property tax bills for this year. Many of the constituents in my district now faces the problem of paying a property tax bill that in the last 10 years have been raised over two hundred percent. And the largest item on that property tax bill was for schools. I think that it is high time and past time that we consider some alternative methods of raising funds to finance our schools and other obligations that the State has. I think, if we think in terms of immorality, it seems to me immoral for a person to have bought a twelve or fourteen, fifteen thousand dollar home, finally got it paid for and now can't afford to keep it because the tax rates are too high for him to afford to keep up with paying the taxes on those homes. I think that this is a good measure and not only that, we should try to come up with some additional, alternative measures of raising taxes, so we can begin to give from the poor people in this State some relief in their tax paying burden. I vote 'aye'."

Murphy: "The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in the 1850's my Skinner ancestors won the 500 pound London Lottery. And because they won



that Lottery, I am now a United States citizen. I think it's time to cut the people in on the syndicate, and for that reason, I'm voting 'yes'."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas, to explain his vote."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons that I feel compelled to explain my vote. The first is that it was I who introduced this Bill in the last session, and I'm delighted that Representative Giorgi has so ably carried the Bill and the second is, that.... the second is, that we need nine more votes for me to win the Lottery that we're conducting here on the Floor to ah.... for me to win a lot of money, and I would appreciate it if we could get nine more people. Thank you, very much."

Murphy: "The Representative from DeKalb, Representative Epton. Are you on Representative Epton, from DeKalb. Ebbeson. "I'm sorry. Ebbesen. I'm sorry."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, gambling certainly prevails illegally every day in the State of Illinois and if some of what is already being spent illegally can be funneled into the State Treasury to assist in answering some of the financial problems of this State, then why not approve of this. I do not advocate that anyone gamble, but since so many already do, let's do it legally. It's for this reason that I vote 'yes' on this good piece of legislation."



Murphy: "Representative from DuPage, Representative Hudson, is recognized."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, apparently, we have agreed here today that we ah... we agree on the principal of morality in general, but not in particular. I'm going to tell you what I think is immoral about this proposition, and that is that we are encouraging the people of this State to enter into something that thousands of them cannot possibly win in so doing. I'm sure there will be a few winners. But there will be millions of losers, and I think that all of those losers can point their finger at the State of Illinois and say, you encouraged us. You helped us. You set up the means by which we could become losers. That's what I think is hypocritical and immoral about this law. This is decay, and I think decay sets in when the State turns to deception, as a means of raising revenue, to pay its way. This is dry rot, in my opinion, in the timbers of good government. This is the way the Romans went when they couldn't tax their people in any other way that went around the corner. They did it through the back door, and Rome fell and this country can fall from the same reasons."

Murphy: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. The Clerk will take two Records. On these two Bills, there are 110 'ayes', 97 'nays', 57 'nays', for what reason does the gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, arise?"



Bluthardt: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Murphy: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Bluthardt: "Well, that's how I feel, but I'm going to change it to 'yes'."

Murphy: "You just cost someone a lot of money. How are you.... Representative Ewell, for what reason do you arise?"

Ewell: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Murphy: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Ewell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Murphy: "All right, on this question, the 'ayes' are 112.

We've got more. Representative from Cook, Representative Totten, for what reason do you rise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. Would you see that 55% of this Lottery, that's going on on the Floor is returned to the State for education?"

Murphy: "Fifty-five percent of that bet is mine, so leave it alone. On this question, there are 112 'ayes', 56 'nays' and one present, and these two bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. 579. House Bill 581."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 581. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "Please, let's have some order in the House. Let's have some quiet please. All right, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson, is recognized."



Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill came up last Thursday or Friday, and I've given day to day life on the matter, and I've had to check into a serious problem about downstate data cards and computers, and we have the problem just about resolved. We're waiting on the appropriate amendment. I asked that it be taken out of the Record at this time."

Murphy: "Take it out of the Record. House Bill 641."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 641. An Act authorizing and directing Department of Transportation to make an examination study at Silver Creek in Cook County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."

Williams: "I think this should be 641, Mr. Speaker."

Murphy: "I'm sorry, House Bill 641 is correct."

Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the fact that this was put over from yesterday since I wasn't here. Flooding is by far the greatest problem that we face here today. A sound residential area cannot be maintained nor can interest in New development be generated unless a sound approach to flooding and drainage problems is undertaken. What we need is a continuous program to prevent natural and man-made obstructions in the stream channels. House Bill 641 is a Bill that authorizes the Department of Transportation to make an examination and study for the purpose of flood relief of



Silver Creek.. Silver Creek is a tributary of the Des Plaines River that runs through both Cook and DuPage Counties. In 1955, the Department of Transportation, which was a predecessor, actually it was the Department of Public Works and Buildings, the predecessor of the Department of Transportation, was authorized to make a study and engineering examination of this stream and compile a report. However, no work has been done to implement the recommendations that were made as a result of this examination. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker.... may I have some order please?"

Murphy: "Please, the gentleman's entitled to order to explain his bill, so let's have some order and give him some attention."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Needless to say, the building boom of the 60's and other changes in the land use patterns have altered the drainage and there is a definite need now to update the 1955 report to determine whether the proposed improvements may yet be feasible, or the alterations needed at this time to alleviate the adverse flooding and drainage in this area. This Bill was approved by the Department of Water Resource Management and passed out of committee with a unanimous 19 to nothing do pass vote. Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I move for the approval of this legislation and I greatly appreciate your favorable support. Thank you."



Murphy: "Is there any further discussion. If not, the question is will this Bill pass? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish. The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 118 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 657." Clerk will you record the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis as voting 'aye' on the last bill."

Selcke: "House Bill 657. Bill for an Act to amend the local mass transit district act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "Representative from DuPage, Representative Redmond is recognized."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 657 is an amendment to a mass transportation bill, which I sponsored back in 1959. It does two things. One, it changes the terminology, from the county board of supervisors to county boards. Since this bill was originally passed, why the county board name has been change, and the other, the bill in its original form provided that a district could not be formed when there was more than 500,000 people in the area. And of course, since we've had a vast increase in population in the suburban areas, that no longer meets the situation, and it just removes that 500,000 dollar restriction and changes the name of the county board from county board of supervisors. As far as I know, there's no opposition, and I



ask for your support."

Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Fred, vote the gentleman 'aye', will you? The Clerk will take the Record. Vote Representative Ewell 'aye'. Representative Juckett 'aye'. Representative Duff 'aye'. Representative Houlihan 'aye'. 134 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Selcke: "House Bill 675. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "We're going to ask you to be in your seats now and vote on these Bills, and not be holding up the time of the House by adding your name afterwards. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson, is recognized."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Governor's task force on Constitutional implementation and the House Committee on Constitutional Implementation suggested that under Article IV, Section 2b, it states that no political party shall limit its nominations to less than two candidates for Representative in any legislative district, and that's what this Bill says. It's a mandatory legislation to implement the constitution to suggest that no political party can ah... limit its nomination to less than two members to the office of Representative. It passed committee 14 to 0 and I urge



a favorable vote."

Murphy: "Ah.... any further discussion? Who's that gentleman right here? Representative Bradley is recognized, the gentleman from McLean."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if the sponsor would yield for a question?"

Murphy: "He indicates he will."

Bradley: "Representative Rayson, if it.... it's in the Constitution already, not that I agree it should be there, but it's already there, why are we having to have this Bill to implement it?"

Rayson: "Because, the Section 8-13 of the Election Code presently under the laws very much differs in the Constitutional mandate so it's just to conform to the Constitution's language and to remove that other language which is an invitation of perhaps a little skullduggery. It's just not applicable anymore and that's all this Bill does."

Bradley: "Well, in your opinion, ah.... is this absolutely necessary to put this in there. I think the Consti.... If it isn't, then I'm assuming that we could still run only one, if you're...."

Rayson: "No, this is mandatory. This is Constitutional language. It makes it mandatory that we implement the Constitution."

Bradley: "O'kay, thank you very much."



Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, will this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative McAvoy, record him as voting 'aye' please. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 93 'ayes' and 9 'nays', the Bill having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared.... this Bill is hereby declared passed. All right, House Bill 785. Record Representative Bluthardt as voting 'aye' on that last Bill please. 785."

Selcke: "House Bill 785. An Act making an appropriation to the Board of Trustees, the Judges Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson, is recognized."

Rayson: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill makes appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System, in the amount of around one million, seven hundred and seven thousand and I urge a favorable vote."

Murphy: "The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I hate to see a Bill go through so easily, when we're going to appropriate the peoples money, without any comment in that. Question I've got, Representative, is how much is the funding percentage for the Judges Retirement System in comparison to the Teachers Downstate



and the Chicago's Teachers Pension. The other Pension Funds of the Legislature and the other Pension Fund that we appropriate money for. What's the percentage of funding?"

Rayson: "I'm afraid I can't answer that question. I can generalize by saying obviously the funding of teachers is woefully inadequate and I'm sure the funding of this is more circumspect and proper, but I will say it's a rather pairing down, because there is a Senate Bill that I just see has come over here which allows for...."

Hanahan: "I can't hear you, Sir, at all."

Rayson: "Well, there is a Senate Bill coming over here on Judges Retirement, which has about two million nine hundred thousand, so I suggest at least it's a rather moderate appropriation, but I can't answer your question as to its percent with regard to Teacher funding."

Hanahan: "Well, then, Sir, one other question, I'd like to ask, is that how much money is going to be expended from the Judicial Retirement, Judges Retirement System in the coming fiscal year. We're appropriating one million six-hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars. I was wondering, how much is going to be expended in the fiscal year 1974?"

Rayson: "Well, they.... they told me that they anticipate that this would be expended or most of it. I mean..."

Hanahan: "We have that many judges on retirement right now, that we're going to spend one million, six-hundred and



ninety-five thousand dollars just for their pension benefits."

Rayson: "Well, I suppose we do."

Hanahan: "I suggest, Sir, before you try to pass a Bill of this nature, you should have that information. Holy.... Your explanations are wholly inadequate as far as what we should be doing with the taxpayers money and spending a million six-hundred and ninety-five dollars toward judges retirement. I suggest to you that the Retirement is very low in the funding, one of the lowest of the systems, but second of all, I do not have the information how much money is going to be expended, and you shouldn't try to pass a Bill until at least we have that much information. What the taxpayers are expected to expend, in taxpayers money concerning Judges Retirement."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, is recognized."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is interesting, I'm rather glad that this Bill came up before my House Bill 556 reached the floor. Because 556 does something somewhat similar, although it is not a general appropriation bill, it's the State Employees Pension Bill. And in that Bill, I advocated that we appropriate money to pick up some of the deficiencies in the State employees bill, and there are other similar Bills covering State employees and the deficiency in their pension fund, but I'm glad that the judges have



got their Bills in first, because I'm quite sure that everyone here who wants to help out the judges, and I'm sure that's all of us will do the same when House Bill 556 is up trying to take care of the deficiency in the Appropriation for the State Employees, and while I don't think \$1200 is going to bring the judges fund up to cover the payments this year, if that's the appropriation amount, I'll buy it, and I'll ask that all the Members who vote for this Bill, to cover this appropriation, do the same for 556."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in reply to Representative Hanahan's questions, the following figures were taken from the Report of the Illinois Public Employees Pension Laws Commission dated 1971. Now this is a biennial report and the next report will be coming up June of 1973, so these figures are the most accurate ones that we could use based upon the last report. The Judges Retirement, the accrued liability is \$32,683,730. The unfunded accrued liability is \$19,846,130 and their rate of funding is 39.3 percent, which the State Teachers rate of funding is 51.2 percent for State Universities. State Teachers is 40.4 percent. State employees is 49.4 percent and the General Assembly is 70.2 percent. In review of this Bill in the Appropriations Committee, there was only one fact that there was a



question about, and that was the administrative expense was, at the budget request, was too low. It was 18,000 dollars and it was raised to 25,000 dollars, so there was a question raised by several members of the Committee, as far as the actual dollar expenditure in this coming fiscal year, which would be coming out of all the retirement funds. Up to this time, we have not received an answer to that question. There is a question between what the board recommends and what we're actually expending. We would hope that maybe in the coming year, we would just go by actual expenses for the various pension funds as far as the dollar amounts that they have to pay in the future. I see no other reason, but to vote 'yes' on this Uill."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook may close the debate."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of this House. I appreciate the comments of the last speaker and he helped answer the question that was deserved to be answered. I do have the sheet in front of me now. I've had trouble with paper this morning, and it is seriously under-funded and it's approximately the same ratio as State Teachers is and it's an important Bill. We do have this liability and I urge a favorable vote for this Appropriation Bill."

Murphy: "Has the gentleman concluded his remarks? All right, the question is, shall House Bill 785 pass? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'."



Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. McPartlin 'aye'. 114 'ayes', 2 'nays', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 581."

SeLcke: "House Bill 581. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask for unanimous consent to ah.... return House Bill 581 to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, it will be taken to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any amendments?" Did you bring the Amendments up to the Clerks desk."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... Representative Totten put on Amendment Number 1. It had a defect in it and ah.... it was a curative amendment to go on, and Representative Totten is holding up a peace sign, and I don't know what he has on his mind."

Arthur Telcser: "Did you bring the Amendment to the Clerk's desk? Representative Totten indicates that he was referring to House Bill 326."

Rayson: "Oh, I'm sorry. No, on 581, Mr. Speaker, we don't have the amendment ready. I will let you know when we do, and I would ask that it be called at that time."



Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, we'll put it back on Third Reading and let it stay there. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 368."

Selcke: "House Bill 368. Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah.... Amendments 1 and 2 were tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment Number 3. Amend House Bill 368, page 1, by deleting lines 8 through 14 and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Dunne for what purpose do you rise, Sir? Robert Dunne."

Dunne: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Dunne: "It would be very helpful to me and perhaps other Members of the House, if you would explain to me what order we're calling on this calendar. What order we're in. I can't follow what's coming up."

Arthur Telcser: "What we've done yesterday and today, Representative, is call the Bills that are dying this week. First, we're calling the Bills that die on May 8th, and then all the Bills that die on May 9th. Then the ones that will die on May 10th. Now, in some of these instances, the Sponsors are not on the floor, so I'll skip over them, and try to get back to them the same day, and now, I've just gone back to Second Reading, to pick up a Bill that has to move today, because tomorrow was the last day to be passed on Third Reading."



Dunne: "What will the next Bills be, to be called?"

Arthur Telcser: "Ah.... Ann tells me this is the last Bill on Second Reading right now. If any amendments come up from the Reference Bureau, to a couple of Representative Rayson's bills, we'll try to get his out of the way. I frankly don't know what I'm going to call next. Ah.... if we get done with the 9th, the Bills that are dead the 9th, I'll go back up to ah.... o'kay, then, that's it. I just can't move from there."

Dunne: "You don't know what the next Bill's going to be?"

Arthur Telcser: "No, because if the amendments, I'm waiting for amendments to come up from the Reference Bureau. I've called House Bill 368 on Second Reading. Are there any amendments? Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Committee Amendment Number 3 to House Bill 368 changes the provision that domestic workers shall qualify for unemployment benefits if they have earned \$500 from one individual employer in a calendar year, to say that instead, these domestic workers must earn \$500 in a calendar quarter. It also adds the definition of domestic servant, that is now used nationally by social security, to the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Lady has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number 3 to House Bill 368. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. O'kay, House Bills



Third Reading. Now, I'm going to try and pick up all the Bills that die on May 9th or May 10th. We've been trying to pick them up during the course of the day, waiting for amendments to come up on the floor. I'll go back to the top of the list, with House Bill 312. Now the rules allow us to go to those that die the 9th or the 10th."

Selcke: "House 312. Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, Representative Dunne, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Dunne: "Point of clarification. Now, will you stay with the Bills on the 9th, or are you going to skip to the 10th and back."

Arthur Telcser: "No, I'll just.... I'm just going to stay with the 8th and the 9th, which the Rules allow me to. Now if I skip one, now, Bob, it will be simply because out on the Floor, the sponsor's not in his seat, and so I may come back to him, when I see him walk up the Floor. I don't want him to lose his Bill. I'll be on the 8th and the 9th."

Dunne: "Thanks, Art."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 312 is the Bill to amend the Minimum Wage Law that we passed last session in General Assembly here. It would change



the minimum wage for the year 1975, 74, to a dollar seventy-five per hour for adults and \$1.40 for those under 18. On January, 1975, it would take affect to \$1.90 per hour for adults and \$1.55 for those under 18. And on January 1, 1976, the minimum wage of Illinois would be \$2.10 an hour and \$1.75 for those under 18. In no way, does the Bill affect any other provisions of exemptions or provisions of the law. It strictly amends the minimum wage laws for the next three years to those figures, and I urge a favorable report on this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 312 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. This question, 122 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rayson, are you ready for 326 now?"

Rayson: "I believe Representative Totten is ready with the Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "You ready, Don? O'kay. House Bill 326."

Selcke: "House Bill 326. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Representative Rayson has Amendment Number 2 and I would ask for leave to return to the order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."



Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections.. If not House Bill 326 will be brought to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments. The Clerk will read the Amendment."

Selcke: "Amendment Number 2. Totten. Amend House Bill 326 as amended in Section 6-50.2, third paragraph from the end and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment Number 2 is just a technical amendment that enrolling and engrossing called to my attention when we put on Amendment Number 1. It inserts ah.... after the word 'commissioners' in the first sentence of that paragraph, the following: 'at such place as the Board of Election', and I move its adoption."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number 2 to House Bill 326. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. We're back on Third Reading. House Bill 326."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 326,"

Arthur Telcser: "Let the Clerk read it, Lee."

Selcke: "House Bill 326. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 326 amends the Election Code. It gives the Cook County and the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners the same options with regard to alternatives to precinct registrations as are now available to downstate counties. It provides for appointment of temporary registers, or deputy registers from lists furnished and certified by the Chairman of the County Central Committees of the two major political parties. It suggests that Cook County may have temporary places of registration and it further suggests that when this is done, that the parties, the Chairmen of each party may present lists to these deputy registers to go in the field, to register voters. Now, I think there's great need for this bill, and I will cite one example. In LaGrange Junior College last year, when we had the drive for registration of 18 years old, we ask the county board of election commissioners to please see that these people are registered. He said he has no authority under the law to so do. The township assessors couldn't do it, because they were from all different areas. We felt that this is a good case for this kind of thing. The other point in favor of this Bill is the constitution requires uniformity of election laws and that's all we're doing because these options are available downstate. I urge a favorable vote."



Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 326 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Duff 'aye'. Telcser 'aye'. This question, 112 'ayes', 4 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. O'kay, Representative Choate is not on the Floor. Representative Juckett indicated he wants to make a Motion relative to 458. Want to make it now, Bob? Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise relative to House Bill 458?"

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 458 deals with an incorporation matter of village and at the committee meeting, I indicated that I would get a meeting together of the three villages that are concerned with the new area. That meeting is going to take place this Saturday, which is the first and earliest time we could do it, so I would move that the death date of this Bill be two weeks from May 9th, which would be the ah.... 23rd of May."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman has moved that ah.... House Bill 485 have its time extended to the date certain May 23rd. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Palmer 'aye'. Take the Record. This question, 140 'ayes', no 'nays' and the gentleman's motion prevails."



Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, ah.... o'kay, we're still waiting for amendments to 581, so we can't call that one right now. O'kay, the Members are informed. We're going back to the beginning of the list on House Bills Third Reading and under the rules of the House, I'm going to take them in numerical sequence now, regardless of the date upon which ah.... they will expire. If I miss a Bill, it will simply be because the sponsor is not in his seat. House Bill 260."

Selcke: "House Bill 260. An Act to prohibit the sale of confidential, financial information. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 260 is a Bill that was suppose to die about two weeks ago and because of an amendment, Amendment Number 3, placed on the Bill, that changed the purport of the Bill substantially, the Majority Leader asked if I would be willing to hold it to this week for Third Reading and, I, of course, agreed to give everybody an opportunity to write to those who have apparently objected to the Bill in its original form and to hopefully receive an answer back from them indicating that they find they have not the same strenuous objection to the Bill as it existed because of Amendment Number 3, as they had to the Bill as it originally was drawn. Now what Amendment Number 3 does, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House, is to not make it so all encompassing so that the interested corporations and businesses who do make a livelihood from this effort are not substantially curtailed in the record. They have indicated to me in several meetings with the members of this industry that they had no objection to the amendment. In fact, it's substantially the amendment they proposed and delivered to me, and what it does is say that ah... confidential financial information contained on a ah... application for credit, for example, cannot be compiled and used, distributed or leased or sold as part of a mailing list. They have told me in meetings with them, the industry, that their main interest is the name, the address and the zip code, which of course they can get out of any telephone book. My objection, of course, to their efforts was, and in conversation with them, that financial information, such as assets, bank balances and so forth should not, because of the interest of the matter of privacy for the individual not be so rented or otherwise distributed, so I think that most of you have had ample opportunity to write to those who have objected to the original bill and perhaps now we can vote on this with some degree of intelligence and with some interest in what I'm trying to do. The Bill does not, and I would like to quote to you from a letter received from the... some of the individuals interested in the Bill. It says,



'We believe Members of our industry can live with the proposed amendment without severely hurting their present operation' Your cooperation will be appreciated. I'd be happy, Ladies and Gentlemen, to try to answer any questions that you might have regarding this legislation, and would remind you finally that it is only an effort to protect your privacy in the matters that affect that privacy as far as confidential information is concerned, and I repeat, I don't feel that this will in any way hamper or hurt or injure those individuals, those corporations that may get their livelihood to sell, rent or otherwise distribute mailing lists containing names, addresses and zip codes."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Mr. Yourell's Bill. I have followed up with the leaders of the direct mail enterprise of the Northern Illinois area at least, and they do, in fact, Mr. Yourell, agree with your amendment and the softening of the original bill, and I urge your support of this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have the opposite reaction. First of all, this Amendment changes the Bill entirely. The Bill does not



even closely resemble the Bill that was ah... introduced a couple of months ago, and the Bill on which there was a hearing. This is ah... not a committee amendment. This is an amendment that was adopted on the floor as you know, and as the Sponsor correctly points out, he was courteous enough to hold it, but I still think we have some objection to it and some very serious objections. In the first place, we're dealing with ah... confidential, financial information that is namely credit reports and things that people applying for credit apply for through banks and other lending institutions. Now if we... with a Bill like this, stop the flow of credit information from financial institution to financial institution and make it more difficult for the people who are offering credit to get information then it can have no other affect then to raise the cost of credit, and so those of us who need credit are going to have to pay more for it. Now another aspect of it is that this information can be traded very freely outside the confines of the State of Illinois as nearly as anyone of the surrounding states and so we're really not accomplishing anything with a Bill like this except that we're chasing the people in business who are accumulating credit information from Illinois and we're losing the employment for the people who live here for the people are engaged in that business, which is, incidently, a very legitimate business, and one not to be frowned upon. So I submit to you, Mr.



Speaker that this is a far reaching bill, that ah.... probably has a good intent, but really doesn't accomplish anything other than to run people out of the State of Illinois, who are working here and have jobs here. And also to make the cost of credit for Illinoisians go up. So I suggest to you that we defeat this Bill. Perhaps give this matter some further consideration in a interim study committee, but not pass it without any kind of a committee hearing."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Bill, but I think he's a little bit messed up in presenting it to the wrong body. I think that this Bill should be presented to the Congress of the United States, that have more control over the postal system than this House has in the State of Illinois. Now this Bill is going to cause undue hardship on people who have been in business many years and in Chicago, it will drive them over across the line into Indiana. They are going to continue in business. It won't put them out of business, but it is going to lose a lot of employment for our people in the State of Illinois. I have letter after letter opposing these bills and amendments, and I can't see any use for it, because the mail is controlled by the postal service and not by the House of Representatives. Thank you Mr. Speaker."



Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to reiterate the comments of the Majority Leader. I have been in contact with some from the mail order industry and they still stand opposed to the Bill, although they do wholeheartedly do favor the amendment. Remember that Representative Yourell's initial purpose was laudatory in attempting to rid the problem of selling lists. Ah... and now the Bill has completely changed and I think that ah.... we want to protect the legitimate business, and I would urge that you vote 'no' against this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... before this Bill was amended, I opposed it. Ah.... both in Committee very vigorously, and in fact, it has been amended in a major way to make it, in fact, not even the same Bill. However, I share the concerns of the Majority Leader and Representative from Lake County, relative to the amendment. For example, in the second page of the amendment #3, which is the substance of the Bill now, and remember the bill has a criminal penalty in it, this ah.... says that it will be an affirmative defense, doesn't say an exception. It doesn't say the person can't be tried on it. It doesn't say they can't be taken into Court. It says that it shall be an affirmative defense, if a company transfers



this information from a parent company to a subsidiary. Now you know, that's going pretty far, to tell a corporation they cannot transmit credit information on one of its customers from the parent company to the subsidiary without being subject to a penalty in terms of a fine or imprisonment. Ah... and to allow them then only to have an affirmative defense. I would agree with the Majority Leader that, and with the Representative from Lake, that a Bill of this substance deserves some kind of Committee hearing.

Arthur Telcser: Is there further discussion? If not, the

gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to reply briefly if I may to some of the statements that have been made relative to House Bill 260. Representative Huskey, my colleague from the 8th District, apparently hasn't read the Bill. This has nothing to do with the postal system or the postal service. It has to do with mailing lists. As to what Representative Duff and Walsh have indicated, I would like to read to you, I know that they are thinking that they're speaking for the Members of this industry, but I would like to read a letter directly from the industry to tell you that they are not speaking for the industry at all. This letter is dated April 3, and it says 'Dear Representative Yourell, Thanks for joining me and other members of the mail ad club yesterday to discuss our concern about this bill.



While we don't agree with that, we can certainly appreciate your feelings about the invasion of privacy issue. As we understand it, your main concern is that confidential information provided on credit applications could be made available to other firms who rent somebody's mailing lists. We pointed out that such information is customarily not released, but concede that nothing is there to prevent a firm from doing so. Therefore, we will prepare a suggested amendment for your Bill. Our feeling is that a proper amendment could eliminate the potential dangers you mentioned. without severely hurting the many Illinois firms who rent or buy mailing lists. We will have the Amendment in your hands the week of April 9. We strongly urge you to hold up any further action on this Bill until you've had an opportunity to receive and consider this amendment. Cordially, Jim Cobbs, President of the mail advertising club of Chicago.

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit that those who are purportedly speaking for the industry, are not speaking for the industry, but my letter from the industry to me relative to this bill containing their Amendment is what they desire, what they can live with and I suggest if you want to securely prevent anybody from evading your privacy, you vote for this Bill. If you don't believe this is the case, then I suggest you vote against it.

Thank you."



Arthur Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 260 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished. Take the Record. On this question, there are 40 'ayes', 71 'nays', and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I want to thank those Members who have voted with me on this Bill and to congratulate those who have voted against me and to indicate that the lobbies have done their work real well on this Bill, and I think I will join them next time and sing their point of view."

Arthur Telcser: "This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Now, I understand, is Representative Rayson on the Floor? That his amendments have been distributed. House Bill 581. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "I assume after 581, that you're going to stay on Third Reading. You'll come back and call the Bills in order, is that correct?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, that's being a little presumptuous."

Shea: "Is that where you will be, Mr. Speaker?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, I don't know how much time Representative Rayson's bill will take. There are other matters of business on the Calendar. If we come back to Third Reading, we'll...."

Shea: "Well, we're on Third Reading now. As I understand it, Mr. Rayson's Bill is the last Bill for the 8th that has



to be out today."

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, as I peruse the Calendar, I think ah... 581 would be the last one. Right."

Shea: "Then you said you were going to take them in order. We just want to make sure Mr. Londrigan's Circuit Breaker Bill gets called today. His tax relief bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, ah.... his Bill does not expire today. There is nothing abligatory or nothing compelling from that point of view to call it."

Shea: "I understand that, but if you're going to call them in order on Third Reading, that's the next bill to be called."

Arthur Telcser: "If we go on Third Reading." Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, ah.... parliamentary inquiry. To exceed to Representative Shea's request, and if we held that after the amendment is put on, would the Bill be called maybe in a half an hour?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, if we adopt the amendment now, Representative Rayson, we can move it back to Third and call it now, if you wish."

Rayson: "Well, I think Representative Shea wants to confer on it before we call it, and I would appreciate that consideration."

Arthur Telcser: "Well now, Representative Rayson, if you wish to move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading...."



Rayson: "Well, I ask for leave of the House to ah.... to return House Bill 581 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, 581 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment Number 1. Amends House Bill 581, on page 1, line 1 and 6 by deleting Sections 8-10 and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Ah.... Representative Berman asks recognition on the Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 581, I offer this Amendment. The Bill was originally would have provided and imposed a requirement throughout the State of alternating precinct to precinct all the candidates in the elections for State, Senate and State House of Representatives. A number of objections arose and I'm offering this amendment, Amendment Number 1, to House Bill 581, which changes this Bill as far as its scope and jurisdiction is followed, it would apply only in jurisdictions where there are voting machines only in the situations where there are two or more candidates to be nominated,.... I'm sorry, more than two candidates to be nominated in the primaries in the election for the



House of Representatives only. Ah.... we ah.... feel that this addresses itself to the problems that ah... the original Bill did without infringing upon the prerogatives of other areas that did not have these problems. I would move the adoption of Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 581."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a... further explanation."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Art, if I get this straight, if we have two candidates in a primary election and only two people file, in Cook County and in downstate,..."

Berman: "Just Cook."

Peters: "Applies to both. Right? It applies...."

Berman: "No, well, I'm sorry. It applies to jurisdictions in which there are voting machines. Now that would be Cook and some parts of downstate."

Peters: "Wherever they've got a voting machine. Now if there are only two candidates, what exactly does your Amendment do?"

Berman: "Nothing."

Peters: "In other words, who files first with the Secretary of State, is still on first."

Berman: "That's right."

Peters: "Now, if more than two candidates file, what happens?"



Berman: "You rotate them."

Peters: "You rotate them. And this does not apply to paper ballot precincts?"

Berman: "Correct."

Peters: "Art, Representative Berman, does this have anything to do with rotation in November, too?"

Berman: "No."

Peters: "Solely applies to the primary?"

Berman: "Correct."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Would you please define for me, Art, a voting machine."

Berman: "What I'm really asking in affect is, do you consider a vote-o-matic, commonly called electronic voting, a voting machine?"

Berman: "No, they would not be covered by this."

Tuerk: "In other words, this would apply to only to the Chicago area where they have voting machines, with the handle on it that you pull down?"

Berman: "It's where they have the voting machines, the mechanical voting machines. I'm advised that Chicago, Cook and five downstate counties."

Tuerk: "This would not apply to the vote-o-matics?"



Berman: "That's correct."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, is there further discussion? Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Will the Sponsor yield for one more question? On the same attack, Mr. Berman, on the vote-o-matic machines we have numbers that we could put on our campaign literature. It would mean a double advertising budget for any one of us candidates, and yet I find no definition here on the differential between voting machine and vote-o-matic and it just disturbs me that it is not a matter of language."

Berman: "The voting machine as used in this Amendment is used in a technical sense, which is defined in other Sections of the Election Code."

Grotberg: "It is?"

Berman: "Yes, and the vote-o-matic are also defined in the Election Code as electronic devices, which would not be covered by this Amendment."

Grotberg: "Thank you. That helps me."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative.... No, sure?"

Kempiners: "My questions have already been answered. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Will the sponsor yield to one question?"



Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Washington: "Art, in the original Bill, it refers to senatorial office and the chief sponsor of the Bill stated that that included the House of Representatives. I was somewhat doubtful. Now does this Amendment clean that up?"

Berman: "The amendment limits the scope of the Bill to strictly the House of Representatives."

Washington: "Does not involve the Senate?"

Berman: "Does not involve the Senate."

Washington: "Now the language 'senatorial office', was that stricken from the original bill or is it still in there?"

Berman: "Yes, ah.... we've deleted ah.... Yes we have."

Washington: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close?"

Berman: "I would just move to adopt the Amendment to House Bill 581."

Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 581. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. Do you wish to have that called on Third Reading? O'kay, House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 581."

O'Brien: "House Bill 581. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."



Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill came up last week, as you know, as a rotation bill for the office of State Representative and State Senator in legislative districts. The question was raised about vote-o-matics and some of these IBM cards for which I didn't have the answer. I have tried to find the answer and was unable to do so, because all of the avenues I sought realized that there was a conflict with this vote-o-matic system downtown. Mr. Berman's amendment, I think is a very practical and worthwhile amendment to make this a fair Bill and make it passable. It now applies to only voting machines, which as I understand it, will only apply to Cook County and whatever the five downstate counties are, ah.... it applies only to the primaries and it applies only to the office of State Representatives and it applies only in those offices wherein there is a contest of more than the normal seats. I think it is a fair Bill and I think we've dissolved the dilemma and I think that this is a way of handling a problem that certainly doesn't at all conflict with the uniformity of the laws of our constitution, so I suggest in fairness that we adopt this Bill and to allow rotation in those areas where it might be applicable. I urge a favorable vote."

Arthur Telcser: "You wish to ask a question? Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."



Bradley: "I was wondering if I could ask a question of the Sponsor of the Bill, and not the Amendment, because"

Arthur Telcser: "Sure."

Bradley: "Lee, if it's fair to have the rotating of the ah.... for the Representatives race and the senators race, why doesn't the Bill apply to rotating all the names of candidates. It seems to me we're locking ourselves in here pretty much to a situation, that if it's good for us, why isn't it good for everybody that's running on the ballot. Not just the House and the Senate."

Rayson: "Well, first, I think you know in the office of State Representative, we have the three boxes. It's quite complicated and many errors occur. Secondly, the fact that you're on, for example, in the City of Chicago, the three vote box is the third box, where in the suburban areas, the three vote box is the first box, and I suggest there's a lot of inadvertent votes cast, because you go down the line, say in the suburbs and you vote on the first box in three votes. You're not necessarily giving that person three votes, but he's locked in. The machine is paralyzed. And I suggest that this is a fair way to handle that problem on the voting machine, and I think if we applied it to all offices, it would cause mechanical problems, but I think there's a precedent for this office only, and that's why we're limiting it to this office only."



Bradley: "Well, I think it's not the best piece of legislation.

I think this Amendment at least cleans it out somewhat, because we were having some problems with this downstate.

It was not workable or manageable. I'm not completely happy with it, but ah.... thank you for answering a question."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Dunne."

Dunne: "Question of the Sponsor."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates a yield. Representative Rayson, do you wish to yield to a question, Sir?"

Dunne: "Leland, did I understand you to say that this rotation does not apply when there are only two candidates in the primary."

Rayson: "If I read this amendment correctly, it says where there are more than two names to be listed on the ballot as candidates for the nomination of a political party. If that's correct."

Dunne: "So if there are only two candidates filed in a political party in a primary, you're not going to rotate."

Rayson: "That's right, because at that point, these are party candidates,"and there's no, you know,... of course, I know there's a little flare up, there's a little underneath in the party activity, but we limit it to those areas where there are more than two in rotation fully applies."



Dunne: "Well, then, how will the ballot position be with respect to the two candidates be decided."

Rayson: "I'm sorry, there's too much static going over here, Mr. Speaker."

Dunne: "How.... how will the ballot position be decided, then, when there are only two candidates?"

Rayson: "When there's only two candidates, you raise an interesting question. The ah.... the lowest should be first one filing, you know, first in, first served. That gets complicated when they file them jointly. Now you recall a few years ago, the Secretary of State did it by alphabet, and they said those with ah.... like you know, Washington or Shea or Rayson are Number 2. I don't consider that. That's a form of lottery I don't support. I suggest fairness says that rotation in that kind of situation allows equal opportunity for this complex ballot."

Dunne: "Well, how can you accept an amendment, then, that ah... doesn't call or that eliminates the rotation when there are only two candidates? I think you've taken all the goodness out of the Bill."

Rayson: "You're raising a good point, Sir, and ah.... and I'm not very ah.... you know, enthusiastic about that portion of the amendment, but I think the amendment braces other things that makes this a fine, workable amendment."



Dunne: "Well.... Well, is there any way, Leland, that... way we can possibly further amend this or ah....?"

Rayson: "Well, I'm suggesting, as you know I had problems with this because of the vote-o-matic situation downstate. I wanted rotation fair for all. But I suggest that if we get rotation in the voting machine area, where there's some kind of contest, we're making a step in the right direction, and I will work in the senate for the kind of amendment which I think you allude to, because I think I can work with your position. And... but I think what we have now on the last dying day is still worthy of passage and I will work and hopefully with you to try to achieve this overall, because I do recognize there is a problem within the parties also that should require rotation."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I think that what we've got here is an attempted political solution to a political problem. What we've done here is to exclude the counties that have had violent objections such as electromatics, excluding them.... we're excluding the candidates where there is no contest, because two will be nominated and two will be chosen in the primary. We're trying to bring a little bit equity into a situation that was highlighted last year, and that is this, that in Chicago and in Cook County, in Chicago primarily, when there were more than



two people nominated, or ah... not nominated but two people filed, when there were three or more people who had filed, the way that the machine was set up in Chicago, they could not put more than two on that top line or on the regular Republican line. I think it was line d. So they had to drop the third candidate or more candidates to the second line. As a result of that, even with strong newspaper endorsements, with strong organizational support, with a lot of support based on an excellent legislative record, the majority leader from the last session, lost in that primary because he was on a bottom line. Three members of the House on the Democratic side of the aisle lost because they were on the second line. There was just no way, realistically to salvage them because of the vaguary of the election machine operations. What we're saying here is this, that if there are more than two people, more than two in that primary that we are giving each of those candidates an equal opportunity to present themselves to the voters. Based upon their record, based upon their constituency, and that each of them will rotate from precinct to precinct in a few election jurisdiction throughout the State, where it has been a problem, and this will bring equity and a fair chance, so that a person who has got a record in this House, for example, doesn't find himself out of office as of the date of filing in the primary. And that is exactly what happened last



year. I think this is a fair Bill. Again, it's a political solution to a political problem. There might be shortcomings, but it certainly is a much better approach than for a guy to wind up on a second line without a chance of ever becoming re-elected in this House of Representatives. I would urge your support for House Bill 581."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise, not so much opposed to House Bill 581, but to offer you some ideas. I heard Representative Rayson mention that ah...., if I heard him correctly, the way the Secretary of State picks the candidates last year. Now my running mate is Representative Calvo. His name starts with a 'C'. My name starts with a 'K'. We both filed by mail. He was first and I was second. On the last day of filing, a man who's name was Kinder, obviously his name started with a 'K'. He was placed third. But in the drawing, in the drawing, those who filed on the first day only, those in second place became first place, by the luck of the draw, and I was on first place, which is a very advantageous position and I can appreciate Representative Calvo's and Berman's also, dilemma in what they're trying to do. But anybody who comes from a highly one party district. I come from a highly Democratic area."



Some of you gentleman on the other side come from a highly Republican area. Now here's what you're going to do. Here's what you're going to do. I think what you're going to do. The fellow who files, some fellows like to file last. They file on the last day. Now I can't quite understand what you plan to do with those people who file on the last day. The Berman amendment, the Berman amendment took care of only those in the Illinois General Assembly House of Representatives. Again I say to you in a highly political contest, in my county, we have the voting machine. It's one of the counties to be affected. We have three incumbent county officers, who all could have, I'm sure the sheriff will have opposition. It's just the nature of the game. Maybe there will be three or four who will run. Maybe one will file the last day, and I still don't understand, and I say this to you again I still don't understand what's going to happen there. Now I appreciate 581 and I think it ought to be kept alive. Something ought to be done. But years ago, seniority meant something in this General Assembly and it seems as though that that's what you're trying to do, is to eliminate seniority from meaning anything at all. If that's the name of the game, that's the name of the game, but you still don't bother paper ballots. All you bother is voting machines of the type that the Berman Amendment designates in Cook County and in five downstate counties and my county is one of them. And I still don't



quite understand what you're asking me to be for or against. My affection for Representative Berman is very good, but I'm just afraid that you got a bad amendment, maybe to a bad bill. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maher."

Maher: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 581 now brings the Bill into exact coincidence almost with House Bill 775, which is on second reading. And the only difference being that House 775 will rotate two for the first two on the ballot. So there is an opportunity for choice here. Either you'll have a choice of rotating everybody on the ballot or the choice of rotating more than two on the ballot in the primary election."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. Representative Kennedy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kennedy: "Well, ah.... the previous question's been moved and I'm just going to vote 'no'...."

Arthur Telcser: "It hasn't moved yet. It hasn't been moved yet."

Kennedy: "Well, can I talk on it?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, it's not a debatable..... The gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor,



signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson to close."

Rayson: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sure we've created a little bit of stir on this Bill, so I want to get back to its rudiments. I'd say the office of State Representative, in its tallying of votes, is a horrendous procedure, and I suggest that the tallying of the results in all of our elections are ripe with error. And I suggest the suburbs of Cook County, by having a three vote box, the one-and-a-half second and one-vote third and in the city, reversing them, creates mass confusion, and I suggest some of us have been elected or defeated due to the inadvertence of voters in casting their vote for this office. And I suggest fairness requires the rotation. And I suggest further that the vote-o-matic system will not allow us to extend this fairness throughout the State, so I think that this is a first attempt and an honest attempt to correct the problem as best we can. Now I feel the amendment should cover all offices as Representative Maher's Bill covers, and I'm supporting his Bill, but I suggest that we should support this Bill, too and send it over to the Senate and if we need to have this corrective amendment on, I'll do what I can to do it and to put it on, but until then, I suggest that when there is contests, let the ballot box be rotated for this office, so that we can have a fair



chance for all people to decide how they're going to vote. After all, the whole purpose of elections is to have the ah... voters, you know, know what they're voting for so we know what the will of the people is. In fairness, Mr. Speaker, and to all you House members, please give us in Cook County primarily, where the voting machine is a problem, a chance to be fair. Give us a favorable vote. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 581 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'aye' on this Bill because I think it gives equal opportunity and equal protection to all the candidates, but I am distressed at the amendment that was offered because this amendment only deals when there is a contest, and when there are two names to be lifted, it does not affect the rotation. I would suggest that we ought to be consistent and have rotation even when there are two candidates, because, both of those candidates will certainly be elected, or at least nominated. Then, their position in the General Election is affected by the vote totals that they have received, and I would suggest that to the sponsor of amendment number 1, that this is not fair and it's discriminatory and it is not equal protection



as the Bill's intending to make. Therefore, I think it's a bad amendment, which has changed the Bill. The Bill does not go far enough, but I think it's a step in the right direction for equal protection, and I vote 'aye'.

Arthur Telcser: "Borcher's votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wished. Take the Record. I'm sorry, gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman. Don't take the Record, yet."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, I would submit to the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House that the purpose of this Bill is to avoid a catastrophe that happened to a number of our colleagues last year and that catastrophe was not that they lost because of their record or because of their approach to the issues in the House of Representatives, but rather that they lost because of situations beyond their control, namely their placement on a ballot, and I say to you that that is no way to lose a re-election contest to come back to this House of Representatives. I don't think there's a person sitting in this House, that can't go back to his constituency based upon his record and be re-elected with a rotation system. But I submit to you and I will give you the names of the people that were involved, Representative Henry Hyde, Representative Jim Taylor, Representative Danny O'Brien, Representative Ira Kolis. These are four candidates that because of their placement on the ballot, primary ballots last year, they were not able to be



renominated. I didn't say that they did not receive sufficient votes. They couldn't be renominated because of the way that the machine was set up, and I think that that's not giving them the kind of chance and opportunity to present their candidacy to the electorates. I don't want to be retired from this House, because of a chance placement on a machine. I want to be able to fight for my renomination if I see fit and I don't want it to be decided by the filing of the petitions in the primary. This Bill gives everyone the opportunity, a fair opportunity to go back and offer yourself for re-election and attempt to get the approval of the voters without being subordinated to a ballot position, whereby it will be impossible for you to come back and renominate yourself or be renominated and run again in November. I think in reference to Representative Maher talking about House Bill 775, as I understand it, that Bill applies state-wide and I know many of you do not want a Bill to be applied State-wide. This Bill does not apply State-wide. It applies to those areas where there's a particular problem, and I would appreciate as many green lights as possible to correct an inequitable situation. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, I see there are enough votes there.

I'm voting for this because I think it's an improvement



but I feel that at... I feel that it's advisable to me to state that I reject the oversimplified idea that Members of the General Assembly are entitled to any more than those people who are seeking public office, and the statements made by the previous speaker, which I have heard him make in the past on a previous Bill, I disagree with. I feel that each time we run, the basic Democratic principal behind a two year old election, as offensive and as annoying as it is to many of us, each time we run, we run not only on our record, but we run in fairness with.... in fair competition with those people who seek the office that we hold. We should have no advantage over them. We should, of course, have every opportunity to talk about our record, but our record should not, in any way, influence the position we have on the ballot, and I cannot accept the idea that because of that fact we're any different then the people that challenge us for office."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to support this Bill, but ah.... I want to relate to you a little bit of personal history. In 1954, I was second on the paper ballot and got beat, re-elected to the General Assembly for my fifth term at that time. Eleven and a half months later, I was third



on the paper ballot and got beat, and I'll support this measure. The previous speaker mentioned something about maybe you don't deserve anything, but if you get beat a couple of times, or twice in eleven and a half months, it will put a little maturity on if nothing else. And I'll vote 'aye'."

Arthur Telcser: "Lady from Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, since I was referred to indirectly, my having beaten Mr. Taylor in the primary, I'd like to set the record very clear. I ran for this office twelve years, five times, and I feel that under any circumstances, having won by a large majority, that I can do so again. I am for election reform, no matter which way it comes. I am going to vote for this Bill, and I'm going to come to the House of Representatives for as many years as I choose to come. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all..... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I read my horescope today, and it said 'keep a low profile'. Thank you very much."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes', 34 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Consent Calendar, Second Readings. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Shea: "Ah.... are we going back on Third Reading?"

Arthur Telcser: "No, it's the intent of the Chair ah....

always contrained by time limits, of course, to go to consent calendar, Second Reading, consent calendar, Third Reading. Ah.... maybe read some Senate Bills a first time and try to get the Constitutional Amendments. A couple of Members have a motion, and I'm sure that will take us far later then we really should be here anyway."

Shea: "Well, ah.... now the Chair has no intention of calling ah.... Mr. Londrigan's Circuit Breaker Bill first thing in the morning, where there might be a shortage of Members on the Floor, does he?" I don't think the Chair would do that on an important measure. We're trying to get some tax relief to the People of the State. Would he?"

Arthur Telcser: "I doubt that the Chair would."

Shea: "All right, just as long as I have that assurance, because that Bill is the next Bill to be called now."

Arthur Telcser: "Except, Representative Shea, that on Third Reading tomorrow, I believe, under the Rules, we could pick up those that expire on May 10th, but that will put us up one more day. So we wouldn't have to....."

Shea: "Why don't we just go back to Third Reading. That's within your power, seeing how you're the temporary speaker and call one more Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, we just called Consent Calendar, Second Reading."



F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 778. An Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 814. An Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 869. An Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 972. An Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 996. An Act to amend Section 5 Shawneed Regional Port District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1012. An Act to amend the local mass transit act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1033. An Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1068. An Act to amend the Illinois Plumbing contractor's certification act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1247. An Act to amend the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1289. An Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 125. An Act to enlarge corporate limits of Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Second Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Third Reading. Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Third Day."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 588. An Act to amend an Act relating to notices. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 660. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 625. An Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill. House



Bill 630. An Act to repeal an Act to provide for the punishment of of any person who drinks any intoxicating liquor and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 774. An Act to amend an Section 2 of the Law Enforcement Officers Retirement Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 788. An Act to amend Section 27 of an Act to establish a military navy code for the State. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 821. An Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 829. An Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 848. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 866. An Act to amend Section 3 of an Act in relation to zoning. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 874. An Act to amend a Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 897. An Act to amend the probate act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 910. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 912. An Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 914. An Act to amend the Illinois Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 164. An Act in relation to the control, maintenance of and the purchase of land and construction of the necessary buildings for public grave yards. Third Reading of the Bill."



Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall these Bills pass? All those in favor, signify by voting.... Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Bradley, Ladies and Gentlemen-of the House, I couldn't pass up this opportunity for a double header, but we have with us a group of school children from Representative Deavers and Lauer's and my district, from the Centennial School in Bloomington, Illinois and I'd like for them to stand up there. They're on the Republican side of the aisle, and we also have a group of Democratic women from McLean County, immediately behind me, and I would like you to recognize them."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall these Bills pass? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, in looking over Senate Bill 164, I have some serious objections about it, and I wonder if this time, I could object to it and ask that it be taken off of the consent calendar."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "I think if he's joined by six people, it can come off the consent calendar."

Arthur Telcser: "That's what I believe. I'm checking the rules."

Shea: "And I'm sure he's got six people that want to join him."



Arthur Telcser: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to vote 'no' against House Bill 588, and the rest, but in looking at 588, from the way I see the Bill, it could mean that school districts could ah.... could hide in ten public places the ah.... as far as the ah.... relation to public notices and I just wonder if that couldn't be detrimental to the public interest and if five want to join me, I think maybe it might be in the public interest to take that Bill off the Consent Calendar, too."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, do five Members join Representative Matijevich? O'okay, they do. All right, at this time House Bill 588 and Senate Bill 164 have been objected to. The objections being joined by five other Members. Are there any further comments? O'okay, the question is, shall these Bills pass? Now this will not include House Bill 588 nor Senate Bill 164. They will be appearing on the Calendar in the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take the appropriate number of roll calls. He'll take one roll call and xerox it. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, May I be recorded ah.... 'no' on House Bill 774 and 'present' on House Bill 625."



Arthur Telcser: "O'kay Record Representative Walsh as 'no' on House Bill 774 and 'present' on House Bill 625. Have all voted who wished? Juckett 'aye'. Take the Record. Borchers 'aye'. Deuster 'aye'. I mean ah.... Ebbesen 'aye'. Ewell 'aye'. On these questions, there are 126 'ayes', no 'nays', and.... Robert Dunne 'aye'. Except for Representative Richard Walsh, and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed." Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 16, for which purpose the gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland is recognized. The Clerk will read it first, Representative."

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 16. 'Resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of this State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 1, 3 and 7 of Article V and Section 2 of Article 10, Constitution to read as follows. Article V, Section 1, Officers. The Executive Branch, shall include the Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of the State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Comptroller and Treasurer-elect by the electors of the State. They shall keep the public



records and maintain a resident at the seat of government during their terms of office. Section 3. Eligibility. To be eligible to hold the office of Office of Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, Supt. of Public Instruction, Comptroller, Treasurer, a person must be a United States Citizen, at least 25 years old and a resident of this State for the three years preceding his election. Section 7. Vacancies and other Elective Offices. If the Attorney General, Secretary of State, Supt. of Public Instruction, Comptroller, or Treasurer fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. If the Lt. Governor fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term. Article 10. Section 2. Supt of Public Instruction. The Supt. of Public Instruction shall have the duties and powers that may be prescribed by law and he may accept as limited by law, establish goals, determine policies provided for planning and evaluation of education programs and recommend financing. Schedule. At the end of the term of the Supt. of Public Instruction, elected in 1970, or upon the earlier existence of a vacancy in that office, the Governor shall make an appointment to fill the office until the election in 1976.



The Supt. of Public Instruction shall be elected in 1976 for a term of two years. This Schedule supercedes Section 7 of the Transition Schedule of the Constitution of 1970.' Third Reading of the Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 16 would put to the voters the question of whether or not the Chief Educational Officer of the State should be elected by the People. This measure would not preclude in any way the establishment of a State Board of Education. You will recall the 1970 State of Illinois Constitution was ratified by the People by a vote of little over one million, four and a little over 800 thousand against, and at that time, in addition to approving the Constitution, four separate proposals were submitted to the voters. One of those dealt with the questions of whether the House Members should be elected from single member or multi-member districts. Another one concerned the question of the election or the appointment of judges. A third asked for a question of whether the death penalty should be abolished. And the fourth proposition asked for approval of lowering the voting age to 18. And it's the feelings of myself and the co-sponsors of this Amendment that this question of this vital importance should be put to the voters, and I earnestly solicit your support."



Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce one of the guests from the gallery. A former House Member, Jim Nowlan."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise with considerable reluctance to ah.... oppose this Constitutional Amendment. But it seems to me that if we reflect on the consideration that the Constitutional Convention gave this question, and their zeal to remove education from politics, and to also shorten the ballot and put education as a prime responsibility of the Governor then we must consider what we're doing here. Now the Constitution also mandates, Mr. Speaker, that we create a State Board of Education. If we create a State Board of Education and if this measure should be approved by the People in the election in November of 1974, then the State Board of Education that we have created will be absolutely meaningless, because we will have a superintendent of public instruction who is responsible to the people and to some extent, the politicians who have elected him and not to the Board of Education, which he'd be directing his activities. Correctly and what the Constitution mandates or asks us to do is that we appoint a State Board and that the principal function of that State Board is to appoint a Supt. of Public Instruction



that is responsible to the Board and not to Committeemen and County Chairmen and the like. So I reluctantly ask Mr. Speaker that the Membership oppose this measure."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise as the co-sponsor in favor of this House Resolution for a Constitutional Amendment. The Majority Leader mentioned something about politics and education. I think we have found in the short time that we are trying to implement the present constitutional change, that it's practically an impossibility, to remove politics from the system of Board of Elections. We've seen that in the last session of the House. We are witnessing it at this time. An issue in my mind, which really involves the fiscal resources of the People of all of our constituency that takes so much of the taxpayers monies, as far as I'm concerned, the people of the State of Illinois want to elect their Supt. of Public Instruction. There is no State Board of Election that will work and reflect the will of the People and remove us from politics unless we're an elected board, and non-partisan elected board, but at this time, I think we would reflect the will of the People if we vote in behalf of the House Resolution 16 and put this matter back before the People and I urge a 'yes' vote on both sides of the aisle for this measure."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman.... Is there further discussion?"

Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Resolution. I think that this is nothing more than right and fair, to give the people of the State of Illinois a chance to vote on this very important issue. Now it's been brought out here that this should be taken out of politics. Well, I think this is the most ridiculous statement we can make in this country when the ah.... when we have a two pointed system. We're not going to take things out of politics. The people ah.... anybody that does this appointment must be elected through politics, and therefore you just don't remove politics when you have a 2. pointed system and I'm sure that most of us want to keep the two pointed system, and therefore, I think the People should at least be given a chance as a referendum to vote on this issue."

Arthur Telcser: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland to close."

Friedland: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again, the Majority Leader is out of step with everyone else. I mean, if he feels the way he does, I'm anxiously awaiting this measure to ah... provide that the U of I trustees be appointed, but in closing, I would just urge your support for this ah.... important issue, to let the people decide whether or not the Chief educational officer should be elected or not."



Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 16? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of this Resolution, I would like to state that the opportunity should be given to the People of the State of Illinois to work on this and think about the cause and this program because of the fact that when all the constitutional officers are abolished or revised under the 1970 constitution, much thought was not given in this area of education. I think we should give many of the citizens of the State of Illinois an opportunity to reconsider, of having another additional in the field of education, which they can control and which they can elect. And especially this last four years, two and a half years, we've had an outstanding personage, Supt. Bakalis, who has shown what a good Supt. can do and I think we should keep that type of individual in office whether... he's elected by the electorates or whether the opportunity should be that it become an elective office again. And I strongly urge your support for this wonderful measure."

Arthur Telcser: Have all.... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "No."



Arthur Barnes: "Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this was a matter in which many individuals and organizations were interested, when the Constitutional Convention met. Having an appointed State Supt. of Public Instruction had a lot to do with the support that many organizations lent toward working for approval of our new State constitution. Groups that favor an appointed State Supt. are our Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, the League of Women Voters, the Illinois Education Association, the Chamber of Commerce. many organizations came down to Con-Con to testify for the inclusion of an appointed Supt. in our new Constitution. We have approved this Constitution, not yet three years. I would ask that we not make a change until we have an opportunity to see how an appointed State Supt. will function. I am opposed to this Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who.... Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was understandably anxious that my 'aye' vote on this proposition not be construed as being in favor of retention of the present Supt. of Public Instruction. I join with the other ninety percent of the educators in Illinois who feel that his services should be terminated at the earliest possible moment, and that's the purpose of this Bill is to put on the ballot, so the public in the solvern



wisdom can choose the right person to lead education.
That's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record.

On this question, there are 115 'ayes', 37 'nays', and
this Amendment, having received the Constitutional
60% vote, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills,
First Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill
103. An Act to provide for the prosecution of actions
against persons who cause damage to school property.
First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 130. An Act
to vacate, extinguish, and abandon easements for right
of way purposes in DuPage County. First Reading of
the Bill. Senate Bill 183. An Act to make an appro-
priations to the Board of Trustees, State University
Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
Bill 184. An Act to make an appropriation to the
Board of Trustees, Teachers Retirement System. First
Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 185. An Act to make
an Appropriation to the Board of Trustees, State Employees
Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
Bill 186. An Act to make an appropriation to the Board
of Trustees, Judges Retirement System. First Reading of
the Bill. Senate Bill 199. An Act to amend an Act re-
lating to Trustees and Land Trustee agreements. First
Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 206. An Act in relation
to County zoning. First Reading of the Bill. Senate



Bill 209. An Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 212. An Act to amend an Act to license, regulate in keeping letting of safety deposit boxes and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill....."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Juckett: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, I have been handed an item which purports to tell us how to vote or how not to vote on certain issues and certain bills that are before this House and the Committees of this House. And it's signed by Len Brenne, and I noticed that on the brand new list of lobbyists, that have been issued by Michael J. Howelett, our Secretary of State, that his name is not included as a lobbyist. And I do object to his passing out or having been passed out any such types of items and I would just like to enter my formal protest on any kind of activity such as this."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't give what was handed out to some of us, the same meaning that the gentleman does. What I have is a copy of a letter to Representative Palmer to Mr. Brenne, making some suggestions to Representative Palmer. Representative Palmer has in turn has given me a copy of it. I appreciate it very much and there's no suggestion here that Mr. Brenne is a lobbyist at all."



Arthur Telcser: "Proceed with Senate Bills, First Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 198. An Act to repeal an Act concerning the hours and employment of females. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 250. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 252. An Act to amend Section I of an Act pertaining to the Illinois Veterans Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 259. An Act to amend the general not for profit corporation act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 266. An Act to amend Sections 10 and 14 of an Act providing for the exercise of right of eminent domain. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 273. Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "General Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 279. Douglas et al. House Resolution 280. Douglas et al. House Resolution 281. Griesheimer et al. House Resolution 284. Douglas et al. House Resolution 285. Douglas."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to ask that the appropriate rule be suspended so that House Resolution 285 can be considered by this Body for immediate consideration. House Bill 285 acknowledges the extremely serious situation that



exists in Illinois today with the wide spread alledged and I have no doubt myself, actual misuse of medical prescriptions which has lead on a wide-spread basis to an extremely great availability of drugs that have caused great pain and anguish among the citizens of Illinois. This resolution would have the legislative investigating commission, which incidently, is uniquely qualified to deal with this subject immediately undertaken an investigation of the field of misuse of medical prescriptions and to report back to the General Assembly by September 1, 1973. And I would move, Mr. Speaker, according to the appropriate rule, that this Resolution be made available to the members of this House for immediate consideration."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the appropriate Rule, Rule 41, be suspended for immediate consideration, adoption of House Resolution 285. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes." Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Sponsor would just briefly go through the explanation. I was off the floor. What does this resolution do? It isn't in our digest."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize many people are preparing to leave the floor, and in explaining my vote, I'd like to mention that this



consideration, immediate consideration has the support of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I've already received assurance, both from the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader that there would be no objection to the immediate consideration of this Resolution, which would have our Legislative Investigating Commission immediately undertake an investigation of the present misuse or obvious alleged misuse of medical prescriptions. The newspapers the last couple of days have indicated an extremely serious problem where prescriptions are being printed, allegedly being printed by non-doctors for the acquisition of drugs, which are getting into the hands of youngsters and others who should not have them, and also there have been severe accusations and serious accusations made against pharmacists who have allowed these drugs to get into the hands of people. If the Resolution were to go to Committee for consideration, and I discussed this with the leadership on both sides, it would delay for weeks the investigation which the Legislative Investigating Commission is prepared to undertake almost immediately if this House would give them the approval to do so and I ask for your favorable consideration. We need 107 votes to get this consideration and I would appreciate, since so many people are presently off the floor, if I could have the help of a few more people so that this could be brought up immediately for consideration."



Murphy: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what Representative Douglas explained to you certainly is a fact. We discussed this this morning with the leadership on our side of the aisle, discussed it with the Chairman of the Executive Committee. He concurred with the ah... expression which Representative Douglas and I made to him. I think it's a good idea, a good resolution, something which I'm sure none of us would oppose and something with which we should deal with immediately."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily agree with the what has been said, but I just wonder, do we have the Resolution? I don't believe I have one."

Telcser: "We don't print and distribute resolutions on motions like this, Representative. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. This question, 122 'ayes', no 'nays' and the gentleman's motion prevails. O'kay, now, the gentleman has now moved that the House do adopt House Resolution Number 285. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Could the Clerk please read the Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, the Clerk will."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 285. Whereas it is generally agreed that wide spread abuses of medical prescriptions in the State of Illinois have led and are leading to the



illegal acquisition of certain types of drugs, and whereas recent revelations in the press have implicated some physicians and pharmacists that allege illegal source of such drugs, and disclose allege illegal coopertive arrangements between such people, and whereas present laws and law inforcement processes have not seceded in dementhishing the extent of this type of activity. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives 78 General Assembly of the State of Illinois that the Lesgislative Investigating Commission is directed to undertake an investigation of field of misus of medical prescriptions and report to the General Assembly by September 1, 1973, pursuant to the provisions of the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission Act."

Telcser: "Gentlemen's offer to move adopt... gentlemar from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I commend this Resolution to the House ah... the Lesgislative Investigating Commission spent a year holding public hearings throughout the state of Illinois on the drug problem, some about a year ago. Pursuant to those hearings thought the State and accross this nation in various places ah... the most compensative drug abuse law any place on the books in the state of Illinois, and I think this would be an extremily good Resolution."



Telcser: "Gentlemen's offer to move adoption of House Resolution Number 285. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Resolution is adopted."

F.B. Selck: "House Resolution 289, Hirschfield ah... House Resolution 291, Fary et al."

Telcser: "Now the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, with respect to a motion."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am at this time moving the chair for the suspension of House rule 41 (a), with regard to ah... a resolution which I have pending before the House ah... A House Resolution 281, which request the Governor of the state of Illinois in otherwise memorializes the the request that he allows the Committee on Senior Citizens to be reinstated, and continue in operation in the state of Illinois, until the House has taken action on House Bill 1405, a by-partisan Committee to create a Senior Citizen ah... department of the state of Illinois, and I am requesting that the appropriate rule of the House be suspended for immediate concentration of this Resolution."

Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr Sp... will the sponser yield for questioning."

Telcser: "In the case, he will."

Shea: "Ah... I understand you spoke to Representative Shurtz, about this and agreed for this to go to a



Committee."

Griesheimer: "That's correct. You say... did I speak to him about it? Yes, I did speak to him about."

Shea: "Did you agree with him, that this should go to a Committee?"

Griesheimer: "We spoke about it and he suggested that it go to Committee and ah... after discussing it we suggested that it be placed on the floor of the House im... I suggested that it be placed on the floor of the House immediately for consideration."

Shea: "Would you mind holding this tomorrow, he's off until tomorrow, he's off the floor now and I would appreciate that."

Griesheimer: "I ah... will hold this until tomorrow and ah... bring it up when Mr. Shurtz is on the floor."

Shea: "Thank you."

Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Fary."

Fary: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, before I move for the suspension of the appropriate rule for immediate concentration of ah... House Resolution 291, could I please request that the Clerk read the Resolution, and then after these I would like to comment on it for about 30 seconds."

Telcser: "The Clerk please read House Resolution 291."

F.B. Selcke: "Of this one?, of ah... Fary's. Ah... House Resolution 291, Fary et al. Whereas the month of May has been proclaim nation Tavern Month. And whereas, this



is an opportunity to reconize and pay tribute to the little joyful tavern keeper that runs the cornor tavern. And whereas, it has been said these servers of good cheer will all go to heaven because they had their hell on earth, and whereas, the good tavern keeper is a variable bower of a community because he usually owns his own property, and pay's the highest taxes of any businesses. And whereas, his children attend the same schools as ours do, they attend the same churches, support church neighborhood functions from weddings, to funerals, from bowling teams, to boys little league baseball, or a girl scout expedition. And whereas, the majority of the little tavern keepers run clean, decent, respectable businesses where you can par-take of your beverage, take ... talk a little politics, discuss the mistakes your favorite team makes, leave your change on the bar and not have it taken from you. Therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives 78th General Assembly State of Illinois. That we congratulate the tavern keepers, that we in the Legislators do consider them first class citizens in two symboles of the free enterprize system, and that we of the General Assembly have toasted their health many times, we have toasted their health alone, we have toasted their health so many times we have almost losted our own. And be it further resolved, that a copy of this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Resolution be sent to Bert Nickerson, the hard working lobbyist for these wonderful people, to our good nature, and good hearted colleague the Honorable John Fary, who has spend some hours in the friendly confines of the local cornor tavern, and to the Honorable W. J. Murphy, and the Honorable Clyde Choate, who have been known to cogitate a bit in these fire establishments."

Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Fary."

Fary: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Probation was a flop. It created the dreaded hoodlum syndicate, it made it fat and so powerful, that to this day it still rears it's ugly head. Probation the tremendous evil that it was, and in 1933 and forced us in to a lesser evil. One which we could tolerate, establishing and harnessing and regulation, and licensing of the distribution of alcoholic beverages, we can now skim off an excitant source of revenue, and I am still not satisfied, because of the harm that it still does to those unable to control his consumption. The effect being disastrous in many situations. I feel that the industry, which enjoys tremendously monitory profits, should by legislation be compelled to erect, construct, and staff alcoholic treatment hospitals. And absorb this entire cost of operation, without one penny cost to the tax payer. And you lawyers and Legislative



brain trusters should sit down with me and help formulate and pass Legislation to this effect. The month of May, Mr. Speaker, is national tavern month. The liquor industry is second only to income tax as a revenue producing item. I think it be fitting to pay tribute this month to the little joyful tavern keeper, the little corner tavern owned by a man who owns property in the Community, supports all neighborhood functions, be it a wedding, or a funeral, a bowling team, a boys little league baseball team, or a girl scouting expedition. His children attend the same school as yours, they attend the same church, his name could be Jake and his wife could be Katie. They brought up nine children of which I could be the oldest and they run a clean, decent, respectable tavern where at the end of the bar rest a wooden bucket filled with herring and wine sauce and raw onions, cheese and crackers, for free. Where you can still lay down a five dollar bill, have a few drinks with your neighbors, talk a little politics, and still get change back. And the House will pop too, to him and his fine wife Katie I want to say to your health. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the toast of various nations who have migrated to this wonderful land of ours, I'm going to ask my good friend, Selcke to please read the toast of the nations".



Belcher: "You'll have to excuse my pronunciation on some of this stuff. 'The British will say . The German will say . The Luithianian will say The Bohemian will say . The Scotsman will say . The Swede will say . The Norwegian will say . The Italian will say . The Jew will say . The Greek will say . The Frenchman will say . The Spaniard will say . And the U.S. American who will drink it all will say 'Cheers, here's mud in your eye, bottoms up, down the hatch, here goes, to your health'."

Arthur Telcser: "Do you wish to put a motion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Fary, has moved that the provisions of Rule 41 be suspended for immediate consideration to have House Resolution 291 passed? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. The gentleman's move prevails and the gentleman now moves that.... offer to move the adoption of House Resolution 291. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I was not here yesterday unfortunately and I would like leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 651. It will not change the results. That's



the Bill which immoralized Casimire Pulaski."

Arthur Telcser: "Death Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 282. Juckett et al. In honor of the Honorable Thomas C Bradley. House Resolution 292. Choate et al. In honor of Mrs. Marvin Loftus."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bill Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the death resolutions."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of death resolutions. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', and the opposed 'no' and the resolutions are adopted." Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to have unanimous consent to Table House Bill 1079. 1079."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, it will be tabled. Are there any announcements? Announcements from Committee Chairmen? None? Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have two announcements. The first one from Coach Deavers, who mercifully announces that the House softball team will not practice tonight, but will practice tomorrow at 5:30 PM at Diamond Number 5 in Lincoln Park, and we'll all pray for rain tonight, now and then. Another announcement, Mr. Speaker, that will tug at your heart strings. The Legislative Correspondents are up against the wall. They must let the St. Nick



Hotel know today how many will attend their annual dinner and grit iron show tomorrow night. You all plan to attend, so when you leave here, head for the press room and get a ticket from either Shelby or Les Paulie, and this is really serious. They do have to know, so if you plan to attend, go to the press room and get your ticket and I'll know you'll enjoy the evening very much. That's for tomorrow night, but you must let them know today."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there further announcements?" Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "And now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until 9:30 AM tomorrow morning for regular session."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the House to stand adjourned until the hour of 9:30 AM tomorrow morning for a regular session. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the House stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 AM tomorrow morning, regular session."

